

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1870.

ART. I.—MOMMSEN'S HISTORY OF ROME.

The History of Rome. By THEODOR MOMMSEN. Translated by the Rev. WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D. With a Preface by Dr. Leonhard Schmitz. In four volumes. American edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869, 1870.

It is certainly one of the most striking and paradoxical phenomena attending the history of the human race, that its record in much, if not the greater part, of its extent should need to be re-examined and rewritten. The statements of contemporaries, or of those who lived much nearer to the events they chronicle than we do, might naturally be supposed to be entitled to be accepted as final. The historical criticism of the present skeptical age is, however, little inclined to such passive acquiescence, and there is no small weight in the arguments which are advanced at least in behalf of a free discussion of the grounds upon which the legends of the ancient world repose. Even the value of the authority of a contemporary may be largely overrated. Undoubtedly, if he holds the pen of a ready and lively writer, while his eye is quick to discern, and his apprehension to lay hold of the salient points in the events that take place in his immediate vicinity, he may give us a picture of unsurpassed brilliancy and distinctness; but it must, almost of necessity, be contracted to a comparatively narrow field. In the battle of life few, if any, are so admirably posted as to be able to obtain a wide and well-proportioned view of all its leading features. In fact, the result of a comparison of different

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXII.—21

contemporary writers is frequently as bewildering as the attempt to reconcile different accounts of a single military engagement, and to extract a consistent narrative from them. Personal prepossessions and prejudices, constitutional peculiarities, varieties of experience, unequal opportunities of observation, and many other circumstances, lead to consequent discrepancies of statement for which the unskilled or cynical critic can find no means of accounting save upon the foolish and uncharitable supposition of willful misrepresentation. The prospect even of the prime actors is far from being uninterrupted, and it is reserved for a subsequent age to rise above the mists of party passion and sectional jealousy, and gain a panoramic view of the wide-extended ground.

It is a still greater mistake to give to writers who lived comparatively near the time of the occurrences they describe implicit faith because of this circumstance, for it not unfrequently happens that a cultivated and intelligent investigator, far removed both in time and place, will avoid the mistakes into which the ignorance and credulity of his predecessors have fallen, while his means of obtaining positive information may be equal, if not superior. After a certain distance has been reached, it becomes a matter of comparative insignificance whether the interval is measured by decades or by hundreds of years.

Yet it must be admitted that criticism, when employed as a means of extracting truth from history that borders upon legend, is a dangerous instrument. Probability, resting, as it does, upon so many and obscure particulars, is always an uncertain, often a treacherous, touchstone. Reasoning from what would be likely to happen is undeniably as unsatisfactory a method of investigating the past, as of prophecy respecting the future. We need not go back to a former age to find ourselves plunged in perplexing incongruities; the history of the day furnishes us with an ample fund, and destructive criticism could perhaps discover quite as many reasons for "Historical Doubts" respecting the existence and achievements of the third Napoleon as concerning those of the first.

We are in a singularly unfortunate situation as respects the early history of that State which, after Palestine and Greece, is undoubtedly the most interesting and important of antiquity. Of the history of Rome under the kings, and for a considerable

period after their expulsion, the learned Niebuhr and his school have made short work. With a single dash of the pen three centuries of the records of the imperial city were obliterated; and every thing before 450 or 500 B. C. became an empty void. Nor were there wanting plausible reasons for this wholesale slaughter of popular traditions. The incredible character of some of the incidents, the large admixture of the supernatural, the poetical tinge given to the entire narrative, all conspired to render it suspicious; and the arguments of the skeptics were supported by an array of such undeniably thorough scholarship that the favorable verdict of the literary world was carried as by storm. Yet it would be contrary to fact to allege that the victory so brilliantly won has remained undisputed. The fatal consequences of pushing the theory of Niebuhr to its legitimate conclusions soon became evident in the depreciation of the value of human testimony in comparison with the deductions of the speculative philosopher. The denial of all truth in the legends respecting the history of an important city for a long period, (all of it subsequent to the era of the Olympiads,) unaccompanied by the substitution of any positive record in their place, was too sweeping to leave the world fully satisfied, and there has consequently been a reaction too marked to be altogether slighted.

Dr. Mommsen is a follower of Niebuhr, and we must not look in his work for any higher appreciation of the legendary history of Rome. Indeed, he takes for granted the truth of the main result at which his great predecessor arrived, and does not undertake to prove its untrustworthiness. While we cannot condemn him for this, we are compelled to regard it as a defect in his treatment of his theme that he does not even deign to give the familiar legends a place, but mars the completeness of his work by rendering his reader dependent on his previous knowledge for all which has passed current for the story of the regal period. Aside from this lack, we welcome this work, for the first time rendered accessible to the American public, as a very valuable and timely addition to our gradually increasing circle of histories truly deserving the name. The remarkable attainments and natural endowments of the author qualify him to cope successfully with a difficult subject. To a profound acquaintance with the language of Rome, and a prolonged

study of the classical authors who have treated of its varied fortunes, Dr. Mommsen adds a rare mastery of the antiquities of Italy, and especially of that source of accurate knowledge—so full, and yet until recently so neglected—the inscriptions. In this department of research he has at the present day scarcely a rival. He crowns these advantages with the scarcely less important requisites of a felicitous method and skill in the effective statement of events, and of a style animated and entertaining, never tame and monotonous, always forcible, and at times strikingly graphic and picturesque. “The reader may, perhaps,” says Dr. Dickson in his prefatory note, “be startled by the occurrence now and then of expressions more familiar and colloquial than is usually the case in historical works. This, however, is a characteristic feature in the original to which, in fact, it owes not a little of its charm.” It is only justice to state that the translator has done his work exceedingly well, and that comparatively few places will be found in which any awkwardness of expression or foreign idiom betrays the fact that the work was written in another language. This is a commendation rarely deserved by translations, especially from a tongue so different in its genius from our own. At the same time it must be confessed that in a few instances Dr. Dickson has allowed himself to employ such strange forms as *custodian* for *custodian*, and that he has too frequently made use of terms with which the ordinary English reader could scarcely be expected to be familiar. The fault is common to Grote and other historians, but it is none the less a fault. The words *hegemony*, (title of chapter vii, and elsewhere,) *symmarchy*, (vol. i, p. 513, etc.,) and *Diadochi*, (vol. i, p. 497, etc.,) are among the less conspicuous instances. We confess that we are unable to see any sufficient reason why our own word *leadership* would not have answered sufficiently well for the first, and *alliance* for the second; while, if the third had been rendered by the words *successors of Alexander the Great*, or simply by its exact equivalent, *successors*, the translation would have been quite as elegant, while more than one poor reader who could boast of no acquaintance with Donnegan, or Liddell and Scott, might have been spared some unnecessary perplexity. And yet we repeat our great satisfaction that this important historical work should have met with a translator so thoroughly a master of the Ger-

man original, and at the same time so ready in his command of his native tongue.

Taking a wider range for his work than the majority of his predecessors, Dr. Mommsen sets out with the intention to relate the history of Italy, not simply the history of the city of Rome. To use his own words:

Although, in the formal sense of political law, it was the civic community of Rome which gained the sovereignty first of Italy, and then of the world, such a view cannot be held to express the higher and real meaning of history. What has been called the subjugation of Italy by the Romans appears rather, when viewed in its true light, as the consolidation into an united state of the whole Italian stock—a stock of which the Romans were doubtless the most powerful branch, but still were a branch only.*

In consonance with this notion of his task, Dr. Mommsen devotes considerable space in his first volume—in a scientific point of view perhaps the most important of the four—to the origin and relationships, and the early fortunes of the primitive races. Italy, he remarks, with its physical structure giving it an "outlook" to the westward, in marked contrast to that of Greece, which is no less distinctly to the east, and so prefiguring its destiny, possesses no traces of earlier or savage inhabitants. There are no fragments of supplanted nations, no mounds disclosing human skeletons of a strange formation, nothing "to warrant the supposition that mankind existed in Italy at a period anterior to the knowledge of agriculture, and of the smelting of the metals."† Three stocks peopled the entire peninsula: the Italian, of which the Latin was one branch, the Umbri, Marsi, Volsci, and Samnites the other, the Etruscans and the Japygians. Says Dr. Mommsen:

To establish the national individuality of these is the first aim of our inquiry. In such an inquiry, had we nothing to fall back upon but the chaotic mass of names of tribes, and the confusion of what professes to be historical tradition, the task might well be abandoned as hopeless. The conventionally-received tradition, which assumes the name of history, is composed of a few serviceable notices by civilized travelers, and a mass of mostly worthless legends, which have usually been combined with little discrimination of the true character either of legend or history. But there is another source of tradition to which we may resort, and which yields information fragmentary but authentic; we mean the indig-

* *History of Rome*, vol. i, p. 27.

† *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 30.

enous languages of the stocks settled in Italy from time immemorial. These languages, which have grown with the growth of the peoples themselves, have had the stamp of their process of growth impressed upon them too deeply to be wholly effaced by subsequent civilization. One only of the Italian languages is known to us completely; but the remains which have been preserved of several of the others are sufficient to afford a basis for historical inquiry regarding the existence, and the degrees, of family relationship among the several languages and peoples.*

Starting with the principle as established, that none of the earliest migrations took place by water, Dr. Mommsen maintains that the Italian race in both its branches reached its central position in the peninsula from the north, and not by crossing the narrow strait at Brundisium. Linguistic comparison confirming the common impression of the close relationship between the Italian and the Greek, who, to use his own expression, are brothers, while the Celt, the German, and the Slavonian are their cousins, he arrives at the following conclusion: that from the common cradle of peoples and languages there issued a stock which embraced in common the ancestors both of the Romans and the Hellenes, and that at a subsequent date, but long prior to their entry into the Mediterranean peninsulas, the Italians branched off from the common stock. In the complete absence of such authentic records as might fix even proximately the chronology of this separation of the Greek and the Italian from the other members of the Indo-Germanic race, all that can now be done is to attempt to gain a general notion of the degree of civilization which their common progenitors had at that time attained. And here language becomes a valuable, and indeed the only, assistant. The Greek and the Latin languages, as well as the Sanscrit, have names evidently derived from the same original for the domestic animals—the ox, the sheep, the horse, the swine, the dog, and even the goose. “Even at this remote period accordingly the stock, on which, from the days of Homer down to our own time, the intellectual development of mankind has been dependent, had already advanced beyond the lowest state of civilization, the hunting and fishing epoch, and had attained at least comparative fixity of abode.”† It is otherwise with agriculture; for the diversity of the appellations

* Mommsen, vol. i. pp. 30, 31.

† Ibid., vol. i. p. 38.

which the various kinds of grain receive, though not a conclusive proof, is yet an item of negative evidence. At least it seems probable that, if practiced at all, agriculture played a very subordinate part in the economy of that early undivided race, making but a slight impression upon the tongue it spoke. On the other hand, the Græco-Italians were acquainted with the cultivation not only of grain, but probably also of the vine. The names of the operations, as well as the implements of agriculture, are to a considerable extent the same; and if we must, as seems probable, reject as utterly inadmissible the old tradition that agriculture, as well as writing and coinage, first came to Italy by means of the Hellenes, this identity of nomenclature attests the existence of an ancient intercourse of a very close character.

It would thus appear that the transition from pastoral life to agriculture, or, to speak more correctly, the combination of agriculture with the earlier pastoral economy, must have taken place after the Indians had departed from the common cradle of the nation, but before the Hellenes and Italians dissolved their ancient communion. Moreover, at the time when agriculture originated, the Hellenes and Italians appear to have been united as one national whole not merely with each other, but with other members of the great family; at least it is a fact that the most important of those terms of cultivation, while they are foreign to the Asiatic members of the Indo-Germanic family, are used by the Romans and Greeks in common with the Celtic, as well as the Germanic, Slavonic, and Lithuanian stocks.*

Or as the results of the investigation are elsewhere expressed:

Thus, in the language and manners of Greeks and Italians, all that relates to the material foundations of human life may be traced back to the same primary elements; the oldest problems which the world proposes to man had been jointly solved by the two peoples at a time when they still formed one nation.†

The question whether Latium was in ancient times as unhealthy a district as at present has often been mooted, and is answered by Dr. Mommsen in the affirmative. Latium proper, the "plain," deriving its name from *lātus*, (side,) or *πλατύς*, (flat,) and in no way from *lātus*, (wide,) as the quantity of the first syllable indicates, was a district about as large as

* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 43.

† Ibid., vol. i, p. 47.

the canton of Zurich. The deep fissures alternating with the tufa hills give rise to lakes, full in the winter season; and the exhalations from these sheets of water, often charged with a large quantity of decaying vegetable matter, are the causes of the well-known fevers of the *Campagna*. Says Dr. Mommsen:

It is a mistake to suppose that these miasmata were first occasioned by the neglect of cultivation, which was the result of misgovernment in the last century of the Republic and is so still. Their cause lies rather in the want of natural outlets for the water, and it operates now as it operated thousands of years ago. It is true, however, that the malaria may, to a certain extent, be banished by thoroughness of tillage—a fact which has not yet received its full explanation, but may be partly accounted for by the circumstance that the working of the surface accelerates the drying up of the stagnant waters.

The difficulty consequently remains of accounting for the fact that a large rural population at one time was able to live in a region so tainted with deadly fevers that no one can reside there with impunity. The historian seeks to meet it by suggesting that man in a lower stage of civilization has an instinctive perception of what nature demands, and a constitution more pliant and elastic.

In Sardinia agriculture is prosecuted under physical conditions precisely similar even at the present day; the pestilential atmosphere exists, but the peasant avoids its injurious effects by caution in reference to clothing, food, and the choice of his hours of labor. In fact, nothing is so certain a protection against the *aria cattiva* as wearing the fleece of animals and keeping a blazing fire; which explains why the Roman countryman went constantly clothed in heavy woolen stuffs, and never allowed the fire on his hearth to be extinguished.*

That under a more equal and favorable tenure of land even so unhealthy a tract of land as the modern *Campagna* might become well cultivated, populous, and prosperous, may be proved beyond a doubt from the parallel instance of the district of Limagne, in the volcanic district of Auvergne, where, with similar physical disadvantages, under a system of extreme subdivision of the proprietorship of the soil, the dense population of twenty-five hundred souls to the square league, or over three hundred to the square mile, is sustained.† In other words,

* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 61.

† Dureau de la Malle, vol. ii, p. 226, *apud* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 62.

this purely rural district is relatively as populous as Belgium with its large manufacturing cities—a kingdom which ranks as the most densely peopled country of Europe. To ruin all this prosperity, as Dr. Mommsen remarks, it would only be necessary to divide the land among six or seven large holders, and to introduce stewards and day laborers in place of the small proprietors. Thus destroying the incentive to manly exertion, “in a hundred years the Limagne would doubtless be as waste, forsaken, and miserable as the Campagna di Roma is at the present day.”*

The fortunes of the Greek colonies early founded on the lower coasts of Italy constitute, according to Dr. Mommsen's view, an important part of the history he has undertaken to write. In this connection it is interesting to notice the extent to which the chronological order of their settlement, and their derivation, are fixed by the monetary standards which they adopted, and, for the most part, retained in their coinage.

The Phœæan settlers coined according to the Babylonian standard which prevailed in Asia. The Chalcidian towns followed in the earliest times the Æginetan; in other words, that which originally prevailed throughout all European Greece, and more especially the modification of it which is found occurring in Eubœa. The Achæan communities coined by the Corinthian standard; and, lastly, the Doric colonies followed that which Solon introduced in Attica in the year of Rome 160, with the exception of Tarentum and Heraclea, which, in their principal pieces, adopted rather the standard of their Achæan neighbors than that of the Dorians in Sicily.†

By no means the least valuable parts of this history of Rome are those which are devoted to the discussion of its progress in the arts of life, in law and justice, in religion, in architecture, sculpture, and painting. It is indeed here, and especially in his valuable chapter on the art of writing, that Dr. Mommsen's uncommonly profound researches in the monumental records of Italy come particularly into play.

We quote some of his remarks respecting the introduction of the alphabetic characters into Italy, especially as regards Latium and Etruria.

This Aramæo-Hellenic alphabet was accordingly brought to the Italians through the medium of the Sicilian or Italian Hellenes;

* Mommsen, *ubi supra*.

† *Ibid.*, vol. i, p. 181.

not, however, through the agricultural colonies of Magna Græcia, but through the merchants of Cumæ or Naxos, by whom it must have been brought in the first instance to the very ancient emporia of international traffic in Latium and Etruria—to Rome and Cære. The alphabet received by the Italians was by no means the oldest Hellenic one; it had already experienced several modifications, particularly the addition of the three letters $\xi \phi \chi$, and the alteration of the signs for $\iota \gamma \lambda$. We have already observed that the Etruscan and Latin alphabets were not derived the one from the other, but both directly from the Greek; in fact, the Greek alphabet came to Etruria in a form materially different from that which reached Latium. The Etruscan alphabet has a double sigma s (sigma s and san sh) and only one k , and of the r only the older form P ; the Latin has, so far as we know, only a single s , but a double sign for k , (kappa k and koppa q) and of the r merely the more recent form R . The oldest Etruscan writing shows no knowledge of lines, and winds like the coiling of a snake; the more recent employs parallel broken off lines from right to left; the Latin writing, as far as our monuments reach back, exhibits only the latter form of parallel lines, which originally, perhaps, may have run at pleasure from left to right or from right to left, but subsequently ran among the Romans in the former, and among the Faliscans in the latter direction.*

Admitting that the Latin alphabet bears on the whole a more recent character than the Etruscan, Dr. Mommsen does not receive this as sufficient proof of the statement that writing was practiced earlier in Etruria than in Rome. The Etruscans seem to have received the alphabet from Greece once for all; while the Romans, in consequence of their close and continued intercourse with Magna Græcia, kept pace with all its successive improvements, and adopted not a few of the most important. More interesting, however, than the mere question of the form or derivation of the Roman alphabet, is that which respects the antiquity of the art of writing. And it is curious to find the tendency of all recent investigation toward the establishment of the fact that, so far from being a comparatively recent invention at the time when the first extant historical works, or other works to whose composition a definite date can be assigned, were committed to parchment or papyrus, this mother of all the arts of life must be referred far back of the commonly accepted age of Homer—the ninth century before the Christian era. Thus it is that the pendulum of scientific

* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 281, and following.

investigation in its violent oscillations seems to vibrate between the farthest extremès. With the idea that alphabetic writing was but little known or employed in Greece before the rule of Pisistratùs in Athens, the plausible theory that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were originally a series of ballads of early minstrels clumsily united in single epics by subsequent compilers also falls to the ground. The supposition that the immortal epopees were the result of successive additions to original poems of much smaller dimensions is likewise overturned by the removal of that which has hitherto been regarded as its chief prop; and that destructive criticism which, with little regard to the true tokens of internal unity and historical consistency, or to the value of the strongest testimony, recklessly attacks the integrity of productions sacred and profane, and as rashly seeks to find the *nucleus* of the prophecy of Isaiah or of Ezekiel, as of the *Iliad* or of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, receives signal discomfiture.

How early the Italians of Latium were acquainted with the use of alphabetic writing is, therefore, a question of more importance than it would at first sight seem to be. For, whatever date we may assign to the first use of the alphabet in the vicinity of Rome, we are compelled to admit a considerably greater antiquity to its introduction to the peninsula at Cumæ and in Campania, and a much more remote period for the origination of the improvements in the primitive characters introduced from Phœnicia into the Greek mother country.

Dr. Mommsen does not attempt to fix the date of the introduction of the alphabet into Middle Italy with any degree of precision, but merely to exhibit the fact that it must have been far earlier than the beginning of the commonwealth.

While the Etruscans thus appear as the instruments in diffusing the alphabet in the north, east, and south of the peninsula, the Latin alphabet again was confined to Latium, and maintained its ground, upon the whole, there, with but few alterations; only the letters γ κ and ζ σ gradually became coincident in sound, the consequence of which was, that in each case one of the homophonous signs (κ ζ) disappeared from writing. In Rome it can be shown that these were already laid aside when the Twelve Tables were committed to writing. Now, when we consider that in the oldest abbreviations the distinction between γ c and κ k is

still regularly maintained;* that the period, accordingly, when the sounds became in pronunciation coincident, and before that again the period during which the abbreviations became fixed, were far earlier than the origin of the Twelve Tables; and lastly, that a considerable interval must necessarily have elapsed between the introduction of writing and the establishment of a conventional system of abbreviation; we must, both as regards Etruria and Latium, carry back the commencement of the art of writing to an epoch which more closely approximates to the first incidence of the Egyptian Sirius-period within historical times, the year 1322 B. C., than to the year 776, with which the chronology of the Olympiads began in Greece.†

Dr. Mommsen adds in a foot-note,

If this view is correct, the origin of the Homeric poems (though of course not exactly in the form in which we now have them) must have been far anterior to the age which Herodotus assigns for the flourishing of Homer, (100 before Rome, B. C. 850;) for the introduction of intercourse at all, between Hellas and Italy, belongs only to the post-Homeric period.

But independently of the indirect proofs afforded by the alphabet itself, our author maintains the antiquity of the art of writing as derived from other indications.

The existence of documents of the regal period is sufficiently attested; such was the special treaty between Rome and Gabii, which was concluded by a King Tarquinius, and probably not by the last of that name, and which, written on the skin of the bullock sacrificed on the occasion, was preserved in the Temple of Saneus on the Quirinal, which was rich in antiquities, and probably escaped the conflagration of the Gauls. . . . When Roman tradition speaks of halls in the forum, where the boys and girls of quality were taught to read and write as early as the time of the expulsion of the Kings, the statement may be, but is not necessarily to be deemed, an invention. We have been deprived of information as to the early Roman history, not in consequence of a want of a knowledge of writing, or even perhaps of the lack of documents, but in consequence of the incapacity of the historians of the succeeding age, which was called to investigate the history, to work out the materials furnished by the archives, and of the perversity which led them to ransack tradition for the delineation of motives and of characters, for accounts of battles and narratives of revolutions, and in pursuit of these to miss such information as it would not have refused to yield to the serious and self-denying inquirer.‡

* Thus *C* represents *Gaius*; *C N*, *Gnaeus*; while *K* stands for *Kæso*.

† Mommsen, vol. i, p. 286.

‡ Ibid., vol. i, p. 288.

In his first volume Dr. Mommsen traces the change of the polity of the Roman State from that original form which he compares to a modern constitutional monarchy inverted—the King having the powers of the people of England, the people that ultimate sovereignty which the King of England theoretically possesses—to the aristocratical form of government in which the Senate became almost omnipotent by the absorption of powers belonging to the Kings which the Consuls were not permitted to inherit, and of the right of appeal, which fell more and more into desuetude. At the same time he delineates the growth of the State externally, until its dominion was extended over the entire Italian peninsula. The successive defeats of the Gauls in the fourth century before the Christian era had for their chief result to prove to the Romans themselves, as well as to the neighboring Italian States,* that they were the bulwark of peninsular civilization against the hordes of barbarians which again and again precipitated themselves upon the southern shores of Europe, and threatened to exterminate the growth of culture on the narrow strip of land where it had just taken root. And it was this view, according to the historian, that tended more than is usually supposed to further the subsequent claims of the Romans to universal empire.* But the intervention of Pyrrhus furnished the excuse, or rather first suggested the necessity of passing the bounds which the ambition of the Senate had up to this time always set for itself. Italy was well consolidated. The Gauls *destroyed*, but never *founded* States. Unlike them, and unlike every other people that struggled for the supremacy in Italy, the Romans permanently retained whatever once fell into their hands. Their statesmanship contributed more to their success even than their military discipline and the personal valor of their troops. From the first, *hope* was a prominent element in their constitution. They were rarely cast down. Overwhelming defeats, which would have brought Carthage to instant submission; the overrunning of their territories, which would have rendered others hopeless of success, only stimulated them to greater exertions, to irresistible assaults. It was characteristic of them, that they voted thanks for not having despaired of the republic to generals who had been defeated in consequence of their own

* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 431.

rashness, and whom the unforgiving Punic Republic would have punished with death.* It was equally characteristic of them, that their Senate would entertain no negotiations for peace when a defeat had recently been incurred. And after conquering, they assimilated. Their great military roads rendered communication easy with their new acquisitions; their colonies rendered the bands of union firm and indissoluble. They remodeled, somewhat unscrupulously, it must be admitted, the constitutions of the cities and States that fell into their power; exalting the aristocracy and abasing the people, and accordingly bringing the subordinate members of the commonwealth into conformity with the pattern of the Roman city itself. At times they seemed almost to emulate the caprice and ingratitude of the tyrant who, when he conquered cities, made citizens of Syracuse out of the nobles who had opposed him, and sold the unoffending common people into slavery, considering the former a much more manageable element in the State.†

But if the control which Rome undertook to exercise over Italy was despotic, the Roman Senate had the wisdom not to overlook the fact, that the only means of giving permanence to despotism is moderation on the part of the despots. The subject communities were not insulted and injured in the same breath; they were not goaded to desperation by losing not only the substance, but even the very semblance of self-government. They either had the full Roman franchise granted in lieu of independence, or were left in possession of a species of autonomy which included a shadow of independence, a special share in the military and political successes of Rome, and above all a free communal constitution—so far as the Italian confederacy extended, there existed no community of helots.

Was it sagacity, or was it accident, that led Rome to steer clear of the rock upon which similar ambitious States have generally made shipwreck? She made no attempt to tax the Italian States: "With a clear-sightedness and magnanimity perhaps unparalleled in history," the Roman commonwealth

* In B. C. 241 the Carthaginians crucified one of their admirals for a loss far inferior to that of the Romans at Cannæ. Mommsen, vol. ii, p. 70.

† Νομίσας δῆμον εἶναι συνοίκημα ὑπαριτότατον. Herodotus, Book VII; c. 156.

"waived the most dangerous of all the rights of government, the right of taxing her subjects. At the most, tribute was perhaps imposed on the dependent Celtic cantons: so far as the Italian confederacy extended, there was no tributary community." And the third peculiarity of Rome's government over Italy was probably quite as important in conciliating the friendship and securing the submission of the inferior States. The burden of furnishing troops for the continual wars was not rolled off upon them. If they took their part in carrying them on, it was under the leadership of Rome, and with her citizens continually before them as their example. The perils and the glories of war were common to ruling and subject cities, and the spoils were divided between them.*

Meanwhile the Roman State can scarcely be said to have advanced with equal rapidity in other respects. Religion continued to be a simple spiritualizing of earthly objects. So material and degrading were its tendencies, that when silver first came into use as a partial substitute for copper in the currency the new metal was assigned a place in the worship of the country as the god "Argentinus," and he was appropriately made the son of the copper god "Æsculanus."†

Law was unequally developed. While the civil law was gradually being perfected, and a system was being formed that has challenged the admiration of the world, "the criminal procedure was completely void of principle, and was degraded into the sport and instrument of political parties." Art remained rude and undeveloped in Northern Italy. At Rome it was neglected, while in Etruria it remained stationary in its first stage, so that Etruscan art, "the stunted daughter," has long been regarded as "the mother of Hellenic art."‡ In fact, Rome was obtaining her empire by the payment of no inconsiderable price. "For Nike, too, is followed by her Nemesis. In the Roman Commonwealth there was no special dependence on any one man, either on soldier or on general; and under the rigid discipline of its moral police, all the idiosyncrasies of human character were extinguished. Rome reached a greatness such as no other State of antiquity attained, but she dearly purchased her greatness at the sacrifice of the graceful variety,

* See Mommsen, vol. i, p. 545.

† Ibid., vol. i, pp. 557-58.

‡ Ibid., vol. i, p. 609.

of the easy *abandon*, and of the inward freedom of Hellenic life." *

The story of the first two Carthaginian wars, of the Macedonian wars, and the war against Antiochus the Great, which takes up the second volume, with the exception of the long and very valuable chapters on the government, the agriculture and internal economy, etc., of Rome during the third period furnishes Dr. Mommsen an opportunity for displaying not only his wide range of research, but also his vigorous, lively, and dramatic power of description. The account of Hannibal's invasion of Italy will be read with most interest as recording the most striking incident, perhaps, in the earlier history of the city. It is well executed, and will amply repay a perusal. The failure of the Romans to check the progress of the bold Carthaginian leader is ascribed not only to the strange want of foresight which they evinced, but to the absurdity of attempting to carry on war with a shifting command, "left year after year to be decided by the Pandora box of the balloting urn." † None of the consuls were Hannibal's match. Even the Dictator, Quintus Fabius Maximus,

Unus qui nobis cunctando restituit rem,

does not, according to our historian, deserve the praise which a later age especially was in the habit of so lavishly bestowing upon him. "It was not the *Cunctator* that saved Rome, but the compact structure of its confederacy, and not less, perhaps, the national hatred with which the Phœnician hero was regarded by the men of the West." But if Fabius was too prudent to be a model of generalship, certainly his course contrasted so brilliantly with the disasters that befell his master-of-horse and subsequent colleague, Minucius, ‡ and the Consul Varro, that we may be pardoned for lingering with some satisfaction upon the respectable figure of the old warrior.

In spite of the fearful rout and slaughter of Cannæ, Rome

* Mommsen, vol. i, p. 581.

† Ibid., vol. ii, p. 162.

‡ How much vividness it gives to the history of events which are now nearly twenty-one centuries old to read of the discovery at Rome, near the church of San Lorenzo, in 1862, of the tablet on which Minucius inscribed the dedication he made to Hercules Victor in consequence of the victory at Gerunium, which secured him his unfortunate elevation to the dictatorship—"Heraclei sacrom M. Minuci(us) C. f dictator vovit."—Ibid., vol. ii, p. 152.

did not fall into Carthaginian hands, nor did Hannibal lay siege to it.

He knew Rome better than the simpletons who in ancient and modern times have fancied that he might have terminated the struggle by a march on the enemy's capital. Modern warfare, it is true, decides a war on the field of battle; but in ancient times, when the system of attacking fortresses was far less developed than the system of defense, the most complete success in the field was on numberless occasions neutralized by the resistance of the walls of the capitals. The council and citizens of Carthage were not at all to be compared to the Senate and people of Rome. The peril of Carthage after the first campaign of Regulus was infinitely more imminent than that of Rome after the battle of Cannæ, yet Carthage had made a stand, and been completely victorious. With what color could it be expected that Rome would now deliver her keys to the victor, or even accept an equitable peace? " *

The wisdom of Rome's conduct toward the nations subject to her ceased, according to Dr. Mommsen, when the victorious legions had passed beyond Italy, and laid in Africa and in the East the foundations for a world-empire. It was, of course, in the very nature of things that Rome should insist upon the humiliation of her Phœnician rival. It was her only safety. "The living of different nations side by side in peace and amity upon the whole, although maintaining an attitude of mutual antagonism—which appears to be the aim of the people of modern times—was a thing foreign to antiquity. *In ancient times it was necessary to be either anvil or hammer.*" † But when the safety of Rome had been fully provided for by the terms of the treaty that closed the second Punic war, when Carthage had been reduced from the position of the mistress, politically and commercially, of the western part of the Mediterranean, and a dangerous rival of Rome herself in Sicily and Magna Græcia, to a tributary city of no importance, save in the matter of trade, it was obviously no less the dictate of sound judgment than of humanity to suffer her to retain undisturbed that measure of prosperity which she still enjoyed. It is not difficult to explain the origin of the rancor with which she was still pursued, exhibiting itself in systematic injustice and neglect of every appeal for redress; but the hatred that could be satisfied only by the complete destruction of the city

* Mommsen, vol. ii, p. 168.

† Ibid., vol. ii, p. 229.

can be justified on no grounds of morals or policy. It was a crime, and it was a serious blunder.

The tolerant and philhellenic treatment of Greece by Flaminus, and his successors in the administration of eastern affairs, is regarded by Dr. Mommsen to have been no less mistaken, although the failing was akin to virtue. Unfortunately Greece, in the second century before Christ, could not be treated with safety as the Romans, who admired the masterpieces of poetry, of painting, of sculpture, and of architecture which she had produced, were disposed to do. The fruits of centuries of dissension, the natural results of a love of independence pushed to an extravagant extreme, together with other evils which need not here be enumerated, had rendered her unfit to accept the measure of liberty which she desired, and which many at Rome were willing to grant.

The proud impotence of the Achæans, the best of the Greeks of their day, is only too faithfully described in the graphic picture which Dr. Mommsen has given us :

The Achæans believed it their duty to display the independence of their State all the more the less they really had ; they talked of the rights of war, and of the faithful aid of the Achæans in the wars of the Romans ; they asked the Roman envoys at the Achæan diet why Rome should concern herself about Messene when Achaia put no questions as to Capua, and the spirited patriot who had thus spoken was applauded, and was sure of votes at the elections. All this would have been very right and very dignified had it not been much more ridiculous. There was a profound justice, and a still more profound melancholy, in the fact that Rome, however earnestly she endeavored to establish the freedom, and to earn the thanks of the Hellenes, yet gave them nothing but anarchy, and reaped nothing but ingratitude. Undoubtedly very generous sentiments lay at the bottom of the Hellenic antipathy to the protecting power, and the personal bravery of some of the men who took the lead in the movement was unquestionable ; but this Achæan patriotism remained not the less a folly and a genuine historical caricature. With all that ambition, and all that national susceptibility, the whole nation was, from the highest to the lowest, pervaded by the most thorough sense of impotence. Every one was constantly listening to learn the sentiments of Rome, the liberal man no less than the servile ; they thanked heaven when the dreaded decree was not issued ; they were sulky when the Senate gave them to understand that they would do well to yield voluntarily in order that they might not need to be compelled ; they did what they were obliged to do, if possible, in a way offensive to the Ro-

mans, "to save forms;" they reported, explained, delayed, equivocated, and when all this would no longer avail, yielded with a patriotic sigh. Their proceedings might have claimed indulgence at any rate, if not approval, had their leaders been resolved to fight, and had they preferred the destruction of the nation to its bondage; but neither Philopœmen nor Lycortas thought of any such political suicide—they wished, if possible, to be free, but they wished above all to live. Besides all this, the dreaded intervention of Rome in the internal affairs of Greece was not the arbitrary act of the Romans, but was always invoked by the Greeks themselves, who, like boys, brought down on their own heads the rod which they feared. The reproach repeated *ad nauseam* by the mass of the learned in Hellenic and post Hellenic times—that the Romans strove to stir up internal discord in Greece—is one of the most foolish absurdities which scholars, dealing in politics, have ever invented. It was not the Romans that carried strife to Greece—which in truth would have been "carrying owls to Athens"—but the Greeks that carried their dissensions to Rome.*

Rarely or never does a nation lose its liberties before it has become unworthy to retain them. It was certainly so with Rome. Brutus and his fellow-patriots engaged in the hopeless task of attempting to galvanize a dead body into life again. If Rome—the people, we mean—had been able to govern itself it would have done so. No usurpation could have mastered it, no cunning plotter of tyranny would have succeeded in binding it down: or if he had been able to involve it in his toils in some moment of temporary obliviousness, the nation would have awaked from its sleep, and have broken the feeble cords with a single exertion of its Samson-like strength; but unfortunately, before the master came the people were ready for servitude. It was as impossible to continue a system of self-government, for which the people were no longer capable, as it has been found within our own times to impose it upon the Spanish-American colonies, whose citizens possess neither the education nor the self-control necessary for its exercise, and whose superstition and skepticism equally militate against its permanence.

Political errors mature their fruit slowly for the most part. The inherent vice does not at once reveal its deadly character. To the contemporaries of Socrates it appeared to be absurd, and almost sacrilegious, when he ascribed the corruption of manners and morals in their day to Themistocles, Pericles, and

* Mommson, vol. ii, pp. 330, 331.

other leaders that flourished in what was regarded as the golden age of the Athenian commonwealth; and it may seem almost as strange to seek for the causes of the degeneracy of the Romans of the Empire in the period of magnificent conquest and unexampled external prosperity which succeeded the war with Hannibal. Yet many of those causes can there be found without difficulty. One of these, to which Dr. Mommsen calls special attention, was the fatal innovation which the vast extension of the Roman territory almost necessarily introduced into the constitution. While Rome confined its authority to Italy it had been possible to maintain somewhat of a semblance of republican equality. Within the limits of the peninsula, with scarcely an exception, every State had either been incorporated into the Roman State or had been received into alliance with it; but when Roman authority crossed the sea there arose tributary States, deprived even of their nominal independence, and governed by their conquerors. Hence arose also the necessity for intrusting Roman citizens, theoretically not a whit superior in rank to their fellows, with almost regal powers. The Roman prætor in Sicily not only resided in the old palace of Hiero at Syracuse,* but succeeded to his powers. In fact, the governor, backed by the overwhelming military force and prestige of his native city, was more formidable to the provincials, whom he ruled with a rod of iron, than the tyrant whom he followed had been. Now this was often, or it seemed to be, the only course that was open to the Romans. They supplanted despotic rulers—the Carthaginians or the Greek kings—and they must govern in like manner in order to be obeyed. They were constrained to model the provincial constitution of Spain after the same pattern. This necessity was “the shirt of Nessus, which they inherited from the enemy.” The possession of absolute power, with little or no practical responsibility, not only begot cruelty, and those corrupt and vexatious exactions under which the natives of the provinces writhed, but for which they could rarely obtain redress from the Roman Senate, but it reared a fatal rival to freedom in its very bosom. It was impossible for him who had been a king in every thing but name, and who had enriched himself from the hard-earned property of unresisting Sicilians or Orientals,

* Mommsen, vol. ii, p. 398.

to resume gracefully and contentedly a place beside the poor burgess of Rome, who, because he had never enjoyed such opportunities for plunder, made but a sorry appearance in comparison. No wonder that through the last century of the Republic the seeds of revolution were sown broadcast, and began to bear fruit.

But more disastrous, because more radically destructive to a free government, was the institution of slavery. For, after all, liberty had never been for all, and it became, as time passed, the privilege of the few. In what we call the later Republic, not to speak of the servitude of the extra-Italian peoples, the great majority of the inhabitants of Latium itself were slaves. Of the free population a small proportion consisted of the wealthy and independent capitalists; the rest were the poor and thriftless, for whom the government was compelled to provide cheap corn from abroad, to the ruin of the agricultural classes of Italy. Evidently we have here a republic in no true sense of the word, but rather an oligarchy, in which the power belongs to those who can buy the most votes of the populace.

For centuries the tendency had been uninterrupted toward the destruction of the small farmers of Italy. The lands were gradually swallowed up in the large estates of the very rich. Grain could no longer be cultivated to advantage, nor, indeed, could any thing else by free labor. The wars of the second and third centuries before Christ supplied the slave market abundantly. It is true that the Roman treatment of slave laborers was destructive, and, like other implements of agriculture, they had to be replaced very frequently. But the cold-blooded calculation of the Roman slaveholder had proved to him that it was cheaper to use up the powers of the human machine quickly and thoroughly, and then to throw it away, than to yield to any feeble suggestions of humanity and prudence, and fail to tax the full energies of the servant. And so it became a maxim—we have it from Cato, the model Roman farmer, himself—that a slave must either be sleeping or working; every waking moment must be put to some service, not a moment given to recreation. Even religion must not interpose to relieve him, which in earlier times “had released the slave and the plow-ox from labor on the days enjoined for fes-

tivals and for rest." "Nothing," remarks Dr. Mommsen, "is more characteristic of the spirit of Cato, and those who shared his sentiments, than the way in which they inculcated the observance of the holiday in the letter and evaded it in reality, by advising that, while the plow should certainly be allowed to rest on these days, *the slaves should even then be incessantly occupied with other labors not expressly prohibited.*"* Buying his slaves just at the age when they reached their full powers, and selling them when they became at all too feeble for severe labor, not allowing them more time or food than was requisite for keeping them in working order, debarring them from marriage, and thus relieving himself from the necessity of supporting any unproductive class of subordinates, the Roman slaveholder could underbid the free laborer, who struggled to gain for his family a scanty subsistence, and drove him to beggary.

We must admit that it is difficult to feel much sympathy or regret when such a bastard Republic loses its so-called liberties. We may not feel quite ready to applaud the instrument of their overthrow, but we can scarcely avoid feeling a certain degree of satisfaction that the world is well rid of so barefaced an imposture. Dr. Mommsen goes further, and gives Julius Cæsar credit for more disinterestedness than his readers will perhaps accord to him. "Like every genuine statesman, he served not the people for reward, not even the reward of their love, but sacrificed the favor of his contemporaries for the blessing of posterity, and above all, for the permission to save and renew his nation."† With justice, however, he exalts his sagacity in preferring to make himself the head of the *nation* by a judicious amnesty extended to his enemies rather than retain power as the chief of a party, although by so doing he alienated the "degenerate democracy" by showing them that his objects were by no means coincident with their own, and even his personal adherents, who had hoped to enrich themselves with the spoils of their antagonists. Cæsar, according to our historian, having "the hereditary right to be head of the popular party," and having "for thirty years borne aloft its banner without changing, or even so much as concealing, his colors, remained democrat even when monarch. His

* Mommsen, vol. ii, p. 438.

† Ibid., vol. iv, chap. xi.

monarchy was not the oriental despotism of divine right, but a monarchy such as Caius Gracchus wished to found, such as Pericles and Cromwell founded—the representation of the nation by the man in whom it puts supreme and unlimited confidence.” *

But Dr. Mommsen is careful to show that if he approves of the work which Cæsar performed it is only because it was, in his opinion, the best thing for Rome under the circumstances; and he protests against a foolish and dishonest application of the lessons of history, which leaves out of view the peculiar features of the various ages. In the true sense, “the history of Cæsar and of Roman Imperialism, with all the unsurpassed greatness of the master worker, with all the historical necessity of the work, is in truth a more bitter censure of modern autocracy than could be written by the hand of man. According to the same law of nature in virtue of which the smallest organism infinitely surpasses the most artistic machine, every constitution, however defective, which gives play to the free self-determination of a majority of citizens, infinitely surpasses the most brilliant and humane absolutism; for the former is capable of development, and therefore living; the latter is what it is, and therefore dead.” “Cæsar’s work,” he adds, “was necessary and salutary, not because it was or could be fraught with blessing in itself, but because—with the national organization of antiquity, which was based on slavery and was utterly a stranger to republican-constitutional representation, and in presence of the legitimate civic constitution, which in the course of five hundred years had ripened into oligarchic absolutism—absolute military monarchy was the keystone logically necessary, and the least of evils.”

It may be added that Dr. Mommsen, in the former edition of his last volume, expressed in no ambiguous terms his skepticism respecting the permanence of republican institutions in the Southern States of the American Union, in close association with the legal slavery of a subject race. It is interesting to find that in his last edition he has been led to give utterance, in a note upon this passage, to his hearty sympathy with the cause of freedom, and his joy in its complete triumph.

* Mommsen, *ubi supra*

When this was written—in the year 1857—no one could foresee how soon the mightiest struggle, and the most glorious victory as yet recorded in human annals, would save the United States from this fearful trial, and secure the future existence of an absolute self-governing freedom not to be permanently kept in check by any local Cæsarianism.

We rise from a perusal of Theodor Mommsen's *History of Rome* with the conviction that it is a very valuable contribution to our knowledge of the progress and decline of that remarkable commonwealth; exhibiting far more fully and accurately than any other work with which we are acquainted the condition of the masses, their religious faith, their degree of culture, their advance in the arts of life, their literary and social privileges, and, in short, all those elements which go to make up the sum of their happiness or misery. Both in this respect, and in the skillful dramatization of the narrative of the political events, it is by far the most natural and life-like delineation of the ancient Romans. We hope that the author may be permitted to continue it, if not through the history of the Western Empire, at least to the point where Gibbon's great work commences. The American publishers deserve the thanks of the reading public for introducing the work to them in a style, upon the whole, superior to that of the English edition. They are, moreover, entitled to special commendation for appending to the last volume an index to the entire work. Strange as it may seem, the English edition, a part of which has been a number of years before the public, is destitute of one; and in this, we believe, it follows the original German issue. An omission of this kind is certainly scarcely pardonable in any work of permanent value, and intended not for rapid perusal, but for close study, comparison, and consultation. But it is the less excusable when the equally flagrant offense is committed of narrowing down the table of contents to the bare heading of chapters. Our own opinion is, that no labor expended in perfecting the appliances for reference in a historical or scientific work, or even in a book of travels, is thrown away. The admirable arrangement of Prescott's works might well be imitated in all similar cases; in which not only is the alphabetical index exhaustive, but in the extended table prefixed to each volume a separate line is generally given to the subject

of each page. On the other hand the reader of Kirk's *Charles the Bold*, until the long deferred publication of the third volume, was absolutely without any means of referring to any given topic contained in the first two volumes.

We must, in conclusion, express our regret at the method which Dr. Mommsen has adopted regarding the authorities upon which his history is based. Not that we approve the plan of overburdening the text with a mass of notes, critical and illustrative, so numerous and detailed as to break in upon the continuity of the narrative proper—a fashion not a little in vogue among his own countrymen. But the practice of the modern school of French historians, of omitting all reference to the writers to whom they owe their information, is far more objectionable. Not only is it unfair to the reader, who, after all, is scarcely to be expected to put implicit faith in statements which the historian disdains to support by alleging his grounds, but it is highly demoralizing to the writer himself. It cultivates recklessness of assertion, careless and superficial investigation, inaccurate and unwarranted generalizations; for it relieves the historian of all fear of that immediate detection which is sure to overtake him if he bases his false assertions on garbled quotations. Independently of these considerations, such a method is a positive injury to the progress of scientific investigation. It entails upon subsequent writers the task of beginning again virtually at the same point where their predecessors commenced, and of laying again the same foundations, instead of rearing a superstructure upon the foundations laid by others. The earlier part of Roman history, in particular, treats of so many controverted questions, and turns so much upon the construction that is to be put upon obscure passages, or the credit that must be given to conflicting assertions of classical writers, that no other method but that of constant and ample citation would seem to be appropriate.

ART. II.—AN INQUIRY INTO THE MEANING AND AIM
OF MATTHEW XXIV, 1-36.

IN order to ascertain the true meaning of our Lord's prophecy in this chapter, the most important point unquestionably is, *the starting point*. And to start right, we must set out from the stand-point of Jesus and his disciples. The disciples, as will appear, regarded both his predictions and their own question from one stand-point, while Jesus regarded them from a point of view entirely different from theirs. Both these facts must enter as elements into the interpretation, in order that we may ascertain the true point of departure.

It will be assumed, at present :

1. That this portion of the discourse was designed, 1) To guard the disciples and their successors against deception, hence that initial, "Take heed;" 2) To introduce suitably the grand theme of the discourse—*the general judgment*.

2. That, with these ends in view, Jesus corrects some of their mistaken ideas concerning the two great coming events in the world's history: 1) The establishment of his mediatorial kingdom on the earth; and, 2) The winding up of that kingdom at his second personal coming "to judge the quick and the dead."

3. That every passage in the discourse is to be construed as relating to the one or the other of these events, according to its obvious meaning rather than its local position.

4. That the seeming confusion of the two events arises mainly from these facts: 1) The two events are carried along side by side through this portion of the discourse, sometimes one being referred to, sometimes the other, so as to make the contrast more apparent, and enable the disciples to discriminate more readily and certainly between them. 2) The transitions from one thought to another, as was common in our Lord's sayings, and as was characteristic of the Aramaic language in which he probably uttered them, were abrupt, leaving the mind of the hearer to supply the connecting thoughts. 3) We have no report of the discourse in the language in which it was spoken, but only a translation of it into a language quite different in its structure and genius. 4. We have no full report of the discourse

in any language, not even by Matthew, but only a pretty full outline; as is evident from a comparison of the three evangelists reporting it.

5. That this mixed portion of the discourse is continued through the thirty-fifth verse, when the former subject is dropped, and the latter carried forward to the end of the twenty-fifth chapter.

It is believed that, bearing these propositions in mind, it will not be difficult to ascertain the meaning and application of every part of the discourse, so that the whole shall appear consistent, harmonious, and adapted to the ends contemplated. We shall not need the theory of double prophecy, though some prophecies may have a double meaning; we shall not need to correct the translation, though in some instances the translation could be very much improved. We shall want a little help, and only a little, from the fragmentary reports of Mark and Luke; and shall find great assistance in ascertaining the stand-point of Jesus and his disciples, by a careful study of what had just before taken place in the temple.

According to this theory of interpreting the discourse, it will appear that the *beginning* and the *ending* of Messiah's kingdom are the two principal subjects considered; that the notions of the disciples concerning these two events were defective, confused, erroneous; that in correcting their dangerous mistakes, our Lord shows that in connection with the first of these events, and for which he had now come, *Jerusalem and Judaism* should perish; but in connection with the second, and for which he would come again, *the world* should be destroyed. And we should remark in passing, that, while the destruction of Jerusalem, and the consequent subversion of Judaism, was by no means the *first* fact in the establishment of Christ's kingdom, it was nevertheless an *essential* fact. It completed the transfer of God's line of operations in subjugating the world from Judaism to Christianity. It was the formal relinquishment of the former, and adoption of the latter in its stead.

It is quite evident, from a comparison of the different reports of the transaction, either that Matthew has misstated the question of the disciples, or that they did not understand the full import of their own inquiry; that Peter, and James, and John,

and Andrew, did not mean all that their words meant. But if we suppose that Matthew gives the question *as they asked it*, and that Mark and Luke give it *as they meant it*, then the statements harmonize. And they harmonize not only with each other, but with Christ's answer also; which answer, upon any other supposition, will be found irrelevant.

1. *What was the question, as the disciples intended it?*

Mark and Luke agree substantially, and Mark's statement of it is this: "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?" But according to Matthew, the latter member of the question is in these words: "And what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" It appears, then, that the disciples understood Christ's coming and the end of the world, whatever their ideas of those events might be, as part of "*these things*" which Jesus had just predicted; and that all "*these things*"—second advent and the end of the world included—would be fulfilled in the fulfillment of his prediction.

But it is not at all likely that by "the end of the world" they meant the destruction of this mundane sphere; or, that by "thy coming," they had any idea of his coming, as he applies it, to wind up the affairs of his kingdom by the general judgment. For, 1. They shared fully the prevalent Jewish expectation of a temporal kingdom, or at least a terrestrial kingdom. This expectation they never abandoned until some time after his resurrection, possibly not until the day of Pentecost. 2. They did not understand as literal Christ's predictions of his own death and resurrection. 3. His mysterious utterances in the temple, only a few minutes before, were yet fresh in their minds. They had heard his terrible denunciation of the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees; they had listened to his pathetic lamentation over the doomed city; they had heard him tell the people that he was about to leave them, to return no more until they should be prepared to welcome him back as the expected Messiah; and they had just now heard him predict the utter overthrow of their beautiful temple.

In view of all these considerations, it is probable—almost certain—1. That by "*the end of the world*," (*συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος*,) the disciples understood and meant the termination of the present order of things, involving the overthrow of all hostile powers,

whether Roman or Jewish, preparatory to the setting up of Messiah's kingdom. 2. That by Christ's predicted *departure* they understood his temporary withdrawal, perhaps concealment, until the way should be prepared for his triumphant return. 3. That by his "*coming*," they meant his reappearing in his manifested character as the Son of David, to take possession of the now vacant throne, to which, as David's heir, he was legally entitled. They understood then, as Adventists understand now, that when Jesus should come again it would be to set up his kingdom, not to end it. And to correct this error, which has proved so fatal in its consequences, was a leading object throughout this portion of the discourse.

2. Having satisfied ourselves as to the meaning of the disciples, the second inquiry is, *What was the proper meaning of their question, as they stated it?*

As already seen, it evidently meant more than the disciples meant. And as we proceed, it will become apparent that the Master answered it, both according to their meaning, and according to its true import. This aspect of the case should not be lost sight of.

Matthew has probably given the question in the very words of the questioner: "When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

This question, evidently shaped under the guidance of an overruling power, is exactly coextensive in its range with the wonderful discourse that follows by way of answer. It takes in its course the predicted events that were then imminent, and sweeps on through the coming ages down to the last grand scene in the world's history. And the question is clear, though nothing was clear in the minds of the questioners. "*When*" should the things just predicted come to pass? This is clear. "*What sign*" should indicate Christ's coming, and the end of the world? This also is clear. *Αἰών* is no doubt a correct translation of the Aramaic word used by the disciples, and very naturally applies to that chapter in the history of God's vast universe which describes man upon earth; or, as it may be known hereafter in the annals of eternity, *the Era of Redemption*. So the Master evidently construed it, and answered the question accordingly. He told the disciples

"when these things" should be. He also told them the *signs of his coming*, but not the time; which, he informed them, God had concealed from even his most trusted and trustworthy creatures.

But, as already stated, in the minds of the questioners nothing was clear. The disciples had some idea, vague and uncertain, that the power of Rome was to be broken; the authority of the priests and elders abolished; the temple and city destroyed; and that, when all things were in readiness, Jesus, the Son of David, who had been somewhere in concealment during these convulsions, was to reappear, take possession of his throne amid the welcoming hosannas of his people, and reign thenceforward in undisturbed peace over the obedient nations of the earth. They had also some idea of "the resurrection at the last day;" but, until life and immortality were brought to light through the Gospel, the future was seen only in dim and confused outline.

They knew not of the long and bloody conflicts, the fiery persecutions, the dangerous heresies, through which Messiah's kingdom was to pass before reaching its final triumph. They had no idea that Jesus was really to die and be buried; that he was to rise again the third day, ascend into heaven, sit down at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, and from thence come again at the end of the world to judge the quick and the dead. Yet these things were to take place, and under Divine guidance the question was shaped, and the answer given accordingly.

While Jesus was with his disciples, always at hand to direct their movements, warn them of danger, and protect them from imposture, their ignorance and mistakes could do but little harm. But now he was about to leave them, and they must be prepared for the hitherto unsuspected dangers and trials that awaited them. They must be furnished with a chart of the future, by studying which they and their successors might secure their own personal safety, and guide the gospel-ship, of which they were to be pilots as well as passengers, safe into the desired haven. That chart is before us.

3. *The Answer of Jesus.*

This, for the sake of convenience, is divided into sections.

SECTION I.—Verses 4-14.

This section is a preliminary survey of the whole field. It is an epitome of human history, especially as it connects itself with the history of Christianity, from the time then present down through coming centuries; beyond the destruction of Jerusalem, beyond the generations then living, and unnumbered generations that should come after, on down to that time in the still unknown future when "this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." And it will be seen that throughout this survey, applicable to every moment of this vast period of time, there runs this one thought, this dominant idea, "Take heed that no man deceive you." We must never lose sight of this βλέπετε, this initial "TAKE HEED."

"Take heed that no man deceive you," etc. The erroneous views of the disciples would render them exceedingly liable to be imposed upon. Supposing, as they did, that Christ's coming to reign in person was near, and not knowing the manner and circumstances of his coming, the information, artfully conveyed, "Lo, here is Christ, or there"—in the desert—or in the secret chamber, might mislead them fatally. And the danger was the greater, because of the signs and wonders with which the deceivers would authenticate their mission. And understanding, as they did, that his coming was to be preceded by violent commotions, they would very naturally suppose, when they should "hear of wars and rumors of wars," that *the end*, as they understood it, was near—that his triumph and their triumph with him was at hand. Supposing, also, that as the friends and favorites of this triumphant sovereign they would be advanced to positions of great honor and influence, it was but reasonable to expect that mankind would do them reverence—that the king's name and favor would be a ready passport to the respect and friendship of all his subjects.

But Jesus corrects their mistakes, and prepares them for the disappointment of their worldly hopes. He tells them "the end is not yet;" that nations and kingdoms in deadly conflict, famines, pestilences, and earthquakes, are but the beginning instead of the end of sorrows—of their sorrows. For he taught them, further, that these sorrows were not to be experienced

alone by his enemies, but by his followers also; and that, instead of finding honor and safety in his name, they should be despised and hated and persecuted on account of that name; that so bitter should be that hatred that the tenderest ties of kindred would afford no protection. He taught them also that this state of things was to continue for ages; and that through all this time there should be false prophets or teachers of religion, who would bring in divers and dangerous heresies, troubling the Church, and drawing away unstable souls after them. And still further, he taught them that the final triumph of his cause was not to be secured by the sword, nor, as some still hold and teach, by a sudden and terrible destruction of his enemies, but by the preaching of the Gospel. This certainly was a picture very different from that which their misguided imaginations had drawn, and was well calculated to prepare their minds for what was to come after.

SECTION II.—Verses 15-22.

This general survey having prepared the way for a more definite answer, Jesus now goes back to the starting point, to consider the question more in detail. But it will be observed that he considers it, not only according to their erroneous ideas of its meaning, but also according to its literal and true import.

“When ye therefore shall see the abomination,” etc. This is a direct answer to the question as the disciples intended it, and, with the thirty-fourth verse, a complete answer. *Quest.* When shall these things be? *Ans.* This generation shall not pass, etc. *Quest.* What sign shall there be? etc. *Ans.* When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place—when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies—when ye shall see the Roman eagles gathering about the city, like vultures around a fallen carcass—then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then make all possible haste to escape; let not one moment be lost.

SECTION III.—Verses 23-27.

“Then if any man shall say unto you,” etc. This section is a special application of the “*Take heed*” with which the Master sets out. Its primary reference is probably to the impostors

and fanatics who abounded about the time of the siege of Jerusalem, though this by no means exhausts its force. The disciples, as is well known, taking heed to these instructions of the Master, escaped both classes of danger. They fled just at the critical moment from the falling city, and thus escaped death or bondage in its overthrow, and they resisted successfully all the attempts of false Christs and false prophets to lead them astray, endured unto the end, and were saved.

In the closing verse of this section, the twenty-seventh, Jesus, for the first time, speaks directly of his own second coming. And he does it in such a manner as to guard his followers in all coming time against false Christs and their lying prophets. The *pretenders* would show themselves in the desert, or conceal themselves in the secret chambers; but *He*, when he came, would appear in the heavens. *They* would be announced by heralds, crying, Lo, here, or there; but *He*, in his appearing, would be self-manifest, and every eye should see him. The establishment and manifestation of *their* claims should be gradual, as adherents should be gained one by one, and as *they* should rise to power step by step; but *His* manifestation of himself in the heavens should be sudden as the lightning's flash, and universal as its light, all the world over. Keeping these things in mind, Christ's followers were in no danger of being misled by impostors.

SECTION IV.—Verse 28.

“For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.” This verse occupies a position so peculiar as to entitle it to special consideration. At first sight, it would seem as if this and the preceding verse must refer to the same event; either both to the destruction of Jerusalem, or both to Christ's second coming. Indeed, this is one of the principal stumbling blocks in the way of expositors of this discourse. Now the twenty-seventh verse refers to the second personal advent of Christ, as manifestly as any thing that follows; and yet, for reasons that will become more apparent as we proceed, the twenty-eighth verse cannot refer to that event, but to one much nearer at hand. The difficulty, however, is more apparent than real.

Ending with the twenty-seventh verse, our Lord had made
FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXII.—23

alone by his enemies, but by his followers also; and that, instead of finding honor and safety in his name, they should be despised and hated and persecuted on account of that name; that so bitter should be that hatred that the tenderest ties of kindred would afford no protection. He taught them also that this state of things was to continue for ages; and that through all this time there should be false prophets or teachers of religion, who would bring in divers and dangerous heresies, troubling the Church, and drawing away unstable souls after them. And still further, he taught them that the final triumph of his cause was not to be secured by the sword, nor, as some still hold and teach, by a sudden and terrible destruction of his enemies, but by the preaching of the Gospel. This certainly was a picture very different from that which their misguided imaginations had drawn, and was well calculated to prepare their minds for what was to come after.

SECTION II.—Verses 15-22.

This general survey having prepared the way for a more definite answer, Jesus now goes back to the starting point, to consider the question more in detail. But it will be observed that he considers it, not only according to their erroneous ideas of its meaning, but also according to its literal and true import.

“When ye therefore shall see the abomination,” etc. This is a direct answer to the question as the disciples intended it, and, with the thirty-fourth verse, a complete answer. *Quest.* When shall these things be? *Ans.* This generation shall not pass, etc. *Quest.* What sign shall there be? etc. *Ans.* When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place—when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies—when ye shall see the Roman eagles gathering about the city, like vultures around a fallen carcass—then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then make all possible haste to escape; let not one moment be lost.

SECTION III.—Verses 23-27.

“Then if any man shall say unto you,” etc. This section is a special application of the “*Take heed*” with which the Master sets out. Its primary reference is probably to the impostors

and fanatics who abounded about the time of the siege of Jerusalem, though this by no means exhausts its force. The disciples, as is well known, taking heed to these instructions of the Master, escaped both classes of danger. They fled just at the critical moment from the falling city, and thus escaped death or bondage in its overthrow, and they resisted successfully all the attempts of false Christs and false prophets to lead them astray, endured unto the end, and were saved.

In the closing verse of this section, the twenty-seventh, Jesus, for the first time, speaks directly of his own second coming. And he does it in such a manner as to guard his followers in all coming time against false Christs and their lying prophets. The *pretenders* would show themselves in the desert, or conceal themselves in the secret chambers; but *He*, when he came, would appear in the heavens. *They* would be announced by heralds, crying, Lo, here, or there; but *He*, in his appearing, would be self-manifest, and every eye should see him. The establishment and manifestation of *their* claims should be gradual, as adherents should be gained one by one, and as *they* should rise to power step by step; but *His* manifestation of himself in the heavens should be sudden as the lightning's flash, and universal as its light, all the world over. Keeping these things in mind, Christ's followers were in no danger of being misled by impostors.

SECTION IV.—Verse 28.

“For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.” This verse occupies a position so peculiar as to entitle it to special consideration. At first sight, it would seem as if this and the preceding verse must refer to the same event; either both to the destruction of Jerusalem, or both to Christ's second coming. Indeed, this is one of the principal stumbling blocks in the way of expositors of this discourse. Now the twenty-seventh verse refers to the second personal advent of Christ, as manifestly as any thing that follows; and yet, for reasons that will become more apparent as we proceed, the twenty-eighth verse cannot refer to that event, but to one much nearer at hand. The difficulty, however, is more apparent than real.

Ending with the twenty-seventh verse, our Lord had made
FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XXII.—23

two important points. He had taught the disciples how to foreknow and escape the coming destruction of Jerusalem, and how to detect and avoid impostors. He was about to pass on to another branch of their inquiry, *the signs of his coming, and of the end of the world*. He was about to describe those signs, as contrasting strongly with those already spoken of as preceding the overthrow of Jerusalem; and before he did this, would place the two events themselves in the strongest contrast possible, and also supplement and enforce the warning already given. He would introduce an illustration that should at once reflect and complete what had gone before, and foreshadow what was to come after.

When, like vultures collecting around the fallen carcass of some beast perishing in the desert, the signs heretofore indicated were seen gathering about Jerusalem, they must know that its life was departing, its last hours had come. But they must not imagine this to be the end of the *world*, the *aiôn* of their question. On the other hand the fall of Jerusalem, with all its unprecedented woes and far-reaching consequences, was of comparatively little importance. It was but the fall of some lone beast perishing in the desert, disregarded and unnoticed but for the vultures gathering around it. What, then, must that event be, the omens of which he is about to describe?

SECTION V.—Verses 29-31.

“Immediately after the tribulation,” etc. This section certainly relates to the coming of Christ, and the scenes accompanying and preceding it. At first, it would seem to place those events immediately after the fall of Jerusalem, to which verse twenty-eight evidently refers. And at this point Luke and Mark afford most important, if not indispensable, aid. In order to avail ourselves of it, however, we must go back a little.

In verses 19-22 we find Matthew's report of our Lord's sayings concerning the calamities that should come upon the Jews at and after the downfall of their city. But from this report we should form no adequate idea of the extent and duration of those calamities. Luke adds several important items in his report, (chap. xxi, verses 22-24,) among which are the following: “And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden

down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." This gives a period of indefinite duration for the continuance of these woes. And it is clear, the second advent cannot take place until they cease—until, the times of the Gentiles being fulfilled, Jerusalem is no longer trodden down of the Gentiles. How long this may be no man knows or can know. But we do know the "end is not yet."

Mark helps us still further. As the case now stands, it would seem that the judgment scenes, or at least the omens preceding the judgment, must commence immediately after the restoration of the Jews—that when their woes cease, the purposes of God in regard to our race will be accomplished, and Christ will at once proceed to wind up the affairs of his kingdom. Is this so? Does this word, "*immediately*," compel us to this view of the case? What was the Hebrew word used by the Master, translated *εὐθὺς* in the Greek, *immediately* in the English, we have no means of knowing. But, happily, we have the means of knowing how the *disciples* understood the Master. Mark (xiii, 24) gives our Lord's saying, thus: "*But in those days, after that tribulation*," etc. This rendering of his meaning would leave the time of his second coming, as he evidently intended to leave it, wholly indefinite. For, in view of his solemn declaration a little further on, (verse 36,) we cannot suppose that he intended to give the slightest intimation of the time of that coming. It could not take place until after the occurrence of certain predicted events, but how long after we have no information whatever.

Allowing Luke, then, to supplement Matthew, and Mark to explain him, all difficulty at this point disappears. And from this point to the end of the thirty-first verse the way is a plain one. This Gospel of the kingdom has been preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations; the days of Jerusalem's humiliation and of Jewish tribulation have passed; that long period of commotion, and strife, and persecution, and imposture have gone by; a season of calm, peaceful triumph has followed, and now the end approaches.

SECTION VI.—Verses 32-35.

The Great Teacher had now nearly completed the answer to the question proposed, and had answered it both as the

disciples meant it, and according to its true import. He had thus far answered both them and their question. He had indicated partially the time, and fully the signs of "*these things*" concerning which they meant to inquire; and had foretold the signs of his coming concerning which, though unwittingly, they really did inquire.

Thus far the two leading themes had been carried along together. Now, one of these themes was to be dropped entirely, in order that undivided attention might be fixed upon matters pertaining to the other. But before this was done he would complete the answer by fixing more definitely the time of "*these things*," and by admonishing the disciples to "take heed" to the signs of their coming. He would also place "*these things*" in still stronger contrast with his own "coming, and the end of the world."

"Now learn a parable of the fig-tree," etc. This section occupies a position very similar to the twenty-eighth verse. It reflects and completes what has gone before, and prepares the way for what is to follow. It gives the disciples information sufficiently definite as to the time of Jerusalem's fall, and urges attention to the instruction already given concerning it. And, taken in connection with the verse immediately following, it completes the contrast between the two events under consideration. It contrasts the *time*, as the twenty-eighth verse did the *magnitude*, of the two events. In magnitude, one is but a solitary beast perishing in the wilderness; the other is a world in ruins. In time, one is near, "at the doors;" the other is distant, and unknown to all but God.

This section represents the scenes to which it refers as then just at hand; the signs of their coming already begin to appear—the buds are bursting in promise of the summer—a summer of tempest, and earthquake, and death. "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all *these things* be fulfilled." What things? Those described in verses 29, 30, and 31? or those of verses 15, 16, and 17? Let us again read the former description, and as made up from the reports of Matthew and Luke united: "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things

which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken." Luke xxi, 25-26. "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." Matt. xxiv, 30, 31. Now can it be that these predictions were fulfilled in the generation then on the earth? Can it be that this language is intended to describe any thing that has yet taken place in this world's history? If so, surely never did oriental imagination indulge in more extravagant hyperbole. No; Jesus never exaggerates. The events here predicted are yet in the future; but those foretold in the second verse of the chapter were witnessed by many then living. And "these things" referred to in verse 34, and "that day and hour" of verse 36, being brought into juxtaposition, appear in the strongest possible contrast: "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all THESE THINGS be fulfilled." "But of THAT DAY AND HOUR knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only."

The answer is now complete—nothing is wanting. The boundary between the revealed and the hidden is sharply defined; and the way is clear for what follows, and which was so providentially called out by the form into which the question was providentially thrown. The disciples inquired, "When shall these things be?" and Jesus answered them. They inquired, "What shall be the sign of the coming of these things?" and he answered them. They inquired, "What shall be the sign of *thy* coming, and of the end of the world?" and he answered them. But, in their intention, the *when* was coextensive with the *what sign*, so that the question was implied, *When shall be thy coming?* And Jesus answered it in a manner that silenced the disciples, and ought to silence subsequent inquirers. That answer was substantially this: "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power."

Taking, now, the stand-point to which Jesus had conducted his disciples, and looking with them down through the coming ages, what a scene presents itself! In the dark foreground we see a people, once more highly favored than any other people under

heaven, now suffering such woes as no other people has ever suffered. And as we look farther on, there rise up before us scenes of tumult, and imposture, and blood, that seem to fill almost the entire field of vision. But as we look, away off in the distant but unknown future, there appears a tract of time during which the earth is at rest, the saints bear rule, and the knowledge of the Lord covers the earth as the waters cover the sea. But as it is so distant, and seen only in perspective, we can form no idea whatever of its extent. It may be a thousand years, or three hundred and sixty-five thousand, or only a few days. But it is seen to end—to end in the grand, final catastrophe. Jesus comes again, not now to suffer for the world, nor to reign over the world, but to judge the world; not to set up his kingdom, but to end it. Jesus comes again—when, God only knows.

PARAPHRASE OF MATTHEW xxiv, 1-36.

In accordance with these views, drawing upon Mark and Luke when necessary, and supplying the connecting ideas in cases of abrupt transition, we might read somewhat as follows:

[Having silenced all his questioners and exposed the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees; having warned the people of impending judgments, and notified them that he was about to leave them, to return no more until they were prepared to welcome him as the Messiah, Matt. xxii, 46; xxiii, 1-39,] Jesus went out, and departed from the temple; and his disciples came to show him the buildings of the temple. Matt. xxiv, 1. And one of his disciples said to him, Master, see what manner of stones, and what buildings! Mark xiii, 1. And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. Matt. xxiv, 2.

And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew came to him privately, saying, (Mark xiii, 3,) Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? Matt. xxiv, 3. [But by his coming and the end of the world, *they* meant the fulfillment of the predictions which he had just uttered; and not, as the *question itself* meant, his coming at the last day to judge the quick and the dead.] And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man

deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. Matt. xxiv, 4, 5.

[And if you suppose that my coming is near, or in any way connected with or comparable to these things which I have just predicted, you are in serious error. Or if you expect the world soon to cease its hostility and submit to my sway; or, if you suppose that your attachment to my person and cause will secure for you the respect and friendship of the world; you must dismiss all such ideas, and prepare your minds for a very different state of things. Long ages of sorrow and waiting are before my followers.]

And when ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, see that ye be not troubled; for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places. All these are [merely] the beginning of sorrows. Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you; and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. Matt. xxiv, 6-10. Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son; and children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death. Mark xiii, 12. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. Matt. xxiv, 11, 12. But in your patience possess ye your souls, (Luke xxi, 19;) for he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved. And, [notwithstanding all this hostility,] this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end [of these troubles] come.* Matt. xxiv, 13, 14.

[But this shall be many centuries hence. The overthrow of this city, however, is at hand; and by careful attention to the signs of its coming my followers may escape the general destruction.]

When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (Matt. xxiv, 15,) and when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Luke

* "Then the end *shall have come*," would be a better rendering.

xxi, 20. Then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains: let him which is on the housetop not come down to take any thing out of his house: neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day: [lest being hindered in your flight, you should fail to escape, and suffer in the common calamity.] For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened. *Matt. xxiv, 16-22.* For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! For there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. *Luke xxi, 22-24.*

Then [during the continuance of these woes] if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. [For in no such manner or place will the Son of man make his appearance.] For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. *Matt. xxiv, 23-27.* [And compared with this event, the destruction of Jerusalem will be an exceedingly trivial affair; not relatively more important than the fall of a beast in the desert, which would be wholly unnoticed but for the vultures gathering around the dead carcass, as the Roman eagles shall gather around this expiring city.] For wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together. *Matt. xxiv, 28.*

But in those days, after that tribulation, (*Mark xiii, 24,*) [predicted, how long after it is not for you to know,] there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; (*Luke*

xxi, 25;) the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, (Matt. xxiv, 29;) and upon the earth [shall be] distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. (Luke xxi, 25, 26.) And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. Now, [before we entirely lose sight of the subject concerning which you intended to inquire, and to which the first part of your question actually refers; and that being properly forewarned you may escape the miseries impending over this people,] learn a parable of the fig tree: When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things—[the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not; the Roman armies gathering about the city, like vultures around a dead carcass, and the like, then]—know that it [the destruction of this city and temple] is near, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things [of which I spake at the beginning] be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. Matt. xxiv, 30-35. [I shall now proceed to speak of my coming, and the end of the world; when, the entire plan of redemption being wrought out, I shall proceed to wind up the affairs of this world by a general judgment. But, concerning the time of that event, it is useless for you to inquire. I have already given you the signs that indicate its coming.] But of THAT DAY AND HOUR knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. Matt. xxiv, 36.

ART. III.—THE TWENTY-SECOND PSALM,
AS ILLUSTRATING THE SUBJECTIVE METHOD OF PROPHETIC
CHRISTOLOGICAL REVELATION.

[SECOND PAPER.]

IN our former article (Quarterly Review, January, 1870) we brought to view the agonistic portion of the Twenty-second Psalm, not for the purpose of exhaustive commentary, but so far only as might serve as a preparation for our argument. We now proceed to consider this Psalm as illustrative of the higher method whereby divine wisdom communicates to man supernatural truths. In approaching the subject we must premise the distinction between revelation and inspiration, and between objective and subjective revelation, and the bodily and mental conditions of the recipient to whom the revelation is made. The difficulty we experience in grappling with the two great thoughts—inspiration and revelation—lies in the method of adjusting the combined agencies of the divine and human elements in each. A revelation must be something in itself absolutely above the natural reach of the human faculties—a direct emanation from God—otherwise it would be a deduction of reason, or a discovery. It must be *supernatural*, and yet in the mode of its communication not *unnatural*; above the plane and scope of human reason, and yet, as to the manner of its communication and reception strictly conformable to the laws by which the human mind acquires its ideas. Inspiration is that degree of divine agency exerted upon the human mind necessary to enable it to discern, understand, and record truth without mixture of error, and agreeably to the divine plan of revelation. As the revelation, on the one hand, communicates ideas conformably to the laws of the understanding, inspiration, on the other, operates in harmony with the freedom of the will. In neither case are the human faculties ever lifted out of themselves, or turned aside from the natural and orderly methods of their operation. It does not require supernatural faculties to perceive supernatural truths, but only supernatural aid afforded to human faculties. All miracles are supernatural, yet, phenomenally, they may be brought within the notice of the senses or the mental cognitions. Thus, as Bishop Sherlock

says, a stone falling to the earth and a stone rising into the atmosphere without physical cause are alike objects of sense, but the one is a miracle, the other not. A man dying and a man rising from the dead are objects equally cognizable by the senses; but the one is a miracle, the other a natural effect. All the miracles of Christ on the bodies of men were as perceptible by the senses as the previous diseases had been. But in spiritual truths the case is not quite parallel. The mind may need assistance to distinguish and comprehend, especially in a class of truths which have but imperfect parallels and resemblances in nature, such as all subjective revelations are. Hence the previous spiritual discipline and experience requisite; and hence, also, inspiration, which is at once an enlightenment and an invigoration of the mind.

In revealing divine truths to man two methods, and from the nature of the case only two, could be adopted. Either the human mind must be lifted out of its sphere and elevated to the plane of the divine mind, or the divine mind must condescend to human infirmity so far as to come within the human orbit, employ human language, and proceed in all respects conformably to human laws of acquiring and expressing impressions and ideas. The former mode is physically impossible; the latter, divine wisdom has adopted. In this method no violence is offered to the human recipient, no dishonor to the divine agent. The human element is purely and intensely human, while the divine is clearly and transcendently divine. Like the mystery of the incarnation, the two natures co-exist in harmonious union in one personality. The "letter" and the "spirit" constitute the revealed word: the divine idea is incarnated in the letter.

In assuming that the mind is always in a state of active self-consciousness while receiving a divine revelation, and that such ideas are received according to the laws by which all ideas are acquired, we do not detract from the supernaturalness of the revelation itself, but only assert the necessary conditions of the human agent in receiving it. And on no other ground could it be a revelation. A revelation is something made known to the human mind; and, as the word in its Greek and Latin derivation denotes, something *unveiled*, *uncovered*; and in the Hebrew, something *seen*, *perceived*; and is sometimes, also,

derived from the verb to *uncover*. To the mind of the holy man of old, who wrote as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, was the subject first *uncovered*, *made manifest*, that through the medium of his understanding others, also, might be instructed. There is nothing mysterious in this, any more than in the influence of one human mind upon another in communicating ideas; nor more than in what Dugald Stewart calls "the inexplicable phenomena of perception and of thought."

Different states, as to the outward senses, were required at different times, according to the nature of the subject to be revealed. In receiving some revelations the senses were closed to all outward objects, as in dreams during natural sleep. Thus, in Gen. xx, 3-6; Num. xii, 6; 1 Sam. xxviii, 6, 15; 1 Kings 3-5. The senses remained closed, also, during the *trance* or *preternatural sleep*, (תַּרְדֵּמָה, *tardemah*, "deep sleep,") though this "*deep sleep*" was not always for the purpose of divine revelation, as in Gen. ii, 21; 1 Sam. xxvi, 12; Isa. xxix, 10. This *trance* state, called in Ezekiel the *ecstasy*, (ἐκστασις, Acts x, 11; xi, 5; xxii, 17,) when made a condition of receiving divine revelations, seems to have been simply a closing of the senses to all outward objects, and the suspension of the action of the voluntary muscles, in order that the mind might act more freely and effectively in its undivided attention to supernatural things. Instances of this state in the New Testament, besides those above referred to, are found in 2 Cor. ii, 1-4; Rev. i, 10; iv, 2; xvii, 3; xxi, 10. In these and all other states of the body, while the mind became the subject of divine communications, the perceptive faculties, and often the sensibilities, were under an inspiration which enabled them to operate with accuracy and great intensity. It was hence the mental cognitions were denominated the most absolute of all human knowledge, as a *seeing*, *vision*, (חֵזיוֹן,) and the person who received them was in earlier times called a *seer*, (רוֹאֶה and רֹאִי.) A *trance*, *deep sleep*, might continue a longer or shorter time. There was no rule as to time but what resulted from the nature of the vision. Peter's continued an hour, perhaps, (Acts x, 10) Paul's, (Acts xxii, 17,) it would seem, a less time; while John the Revelator probably continued thus "in the Spirit" for days at a time. The mind must have time for the succession of events, and for distinct impressions and ideas. In all cases, however, the

prophet, or holy man, prostrated himself, as in Ezek. i, 28; Dan. viii, 17, 18; x, 8, 9; Rev. i, 17. The case of Balaam, as well as that of Daniel, affords some noticeable particulars. In allusion to the clear cognitions of the mind at these times, Balaam prefaced the announcement of his oracles with the stated formula, more or less full, "Balaam the son of Beor hath said, and the man *whose eyes are open* hath said; he hath said *which heard the words of God, which knew the knowledge of the Most High; which saw the vision of the Almighty; falling into a trance, but having his eyes open.*" Literally, *falling down, or prostrating himself, but being unvaild as to his eyes.* Num. xxiv, 3, 4-16. This unvailing of the eye, or having "the eyes opened," is to be understood figuratively of the mental perceptions, as the same figure applies to the eye and ear, Job xxxiii, 15, 16; xxx, 10-15; Psalm xl, 6; cxix, 18. We wholly discard the heathen theory adopted by the Jews, at least of the Alexandrian school, sanctioned by Josephus, and reproduced by the Montanists, that the prophets while receiving their messages or revelations were in a state of unconscious passiveness.

The methods adopted to communicate supernatural truths to men have been uniformly grounded upon two considerations, which have the force of laws: first, the nature of the truth to be revealed; secondly, the corresponding disposition of the mind to receive it. There can be no revelation without a favorable precondition of the mind to receive it. In regard to objective revelations, the mental preparation is not so difficult, but the law still obtains. Both the moral and intellectual states of the mind are accurately measured, so to speak, and the revelation adapted thereto. The process here must be gradational, from the lowest to the highest, from the germ to the full development; and the transition from the sensible to the spiritual, the objective to the subjective, must also be marked by the same gradational process. This is precisely the order of the historical development of the dispensations—the order from the Old Testament to the New—and in nothing is it more marked than in the special department of Christology. To Adam it was given in the general idea of a deliverer, and in language and metaphor most suited to impress his mind. To him the "Seed of the woman" and the "serpent"—their antagonism and

the triumph of the former—were easily understood. But the revelation was simply objective, with an admissible and implied spiritual application. In all the primeval period (anterior to Abraham) the Messianic doctrine existed only in “sporadic lights” of promise, couched in the higher allegory and type. In Abraham was superadded the more tangible and particular idea of genealogical descent. To Adam, and down to Abraham, the “Seed of the woman” assured the patriarchs of the *human* form of the Deliverer; but now it was revealed that this Deliverer was to be of “the seed of Abraham.” The advance was great, but the revelation still retained its objective form. It came closer to the human sympathy and the realizing power of faith; but except in the “*Jehovah-jireh*,” entered not the more subjective realm of Messianic revelation. The idea of substitution—life for life—as a ground of pardon and acceptance, was taught in animal sacrifice as an indispensable requisite of worship. The idea of a Saviour, under the title of “the Seed of the woman,” and “the Seed of Abraham,” was now also revealed. Later the idea of a ruler or king, was added. How could these meet in one and the same person? All advance in Messianic prophecy—we should say, Old Testament Christophany—was henceforward in the direction to shed light on this question. Into this, “the prophets inquired and searched diligently, searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, *when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ*, and the glory that should follow.” 1 Pet. i, 11.

All revelations may be classed under the two heads *objective* and *subjective*. These are distinguished by the nature of the truths themselves, by the preparatory spiritual development required in the recipient, and by his historic conditions at the moment of receiving the communication. It is plain enough that if the plan of revelation proceeds upon the principle of bringing divine truth within the sphere of the human capacity, and imparting it conformably to the laws of the human understanding, the chief difficulty lies in bringing the mind, in its mental conceptions and moral sensibility, to a state correspondent to the nature of the truth to be revealed. Objective revelations—revelations of facts and dates, of historical developments and catastrophes in individuals or in empires,

or of doctrines as symbols of faith—could be more easily made known. Even Messiah could be preannounced in his human personality, his kingly dominion, his conquests, or in his prophetic office, without a high degree of spiritual intuition in the subject through whom the revelation is made. And for such oracles the “voice of God speaking,” or an angelic ministration, or a dream, or a vision, might suffice. But there is a class of profounder truths—truths bedding in the human consciousness—for which these ordinary methods of revelation offer inadequate channels. The vision, or ecstasy, offers some aid; we may even say, with Lange, it is the prevailing subjective form of the Old Testament theophany; but it is not the only nor the highest form. There are ends which it cannot serve. It is inadequate to the highest reach of the ideal Christophany. This was the culminating point of the Old Testament revelation. To present Christ to the eye of faith in order that faith, by the Holy Spirit, might become a living channel of saving grace, and co-ordinately a preparative for the Gospel, was the end of all divine dispensation. The presentation is objective, the appropriations of faith subjective, Christophany. To lodge these sublime ideas in the mind, and to awaken the depths of its consciousness to a new life, required methods of revelation which should bring the intellectual powers, the sensibilities, the imagination, and the consciousness into intensest action. It must be considered that the true Christological idea must be *originated* and lodged in the mind. The idea was not in possession, and the mind was not prepared to receive it, and the knowledge of man supplied no adequate suggestive analogies. Something had been gained in the primeval period, something in the patriarchal, and an advance still further made in the dynamical Christophanies of the Mosaic system. Words had expended their power; types and symbols had unveiled a higher significance; sudden inspirations had afforded glimpses of precocious light; historic occasions, as in the case of Abraham in the “*Jehovah-jireh*,” had added their tribute; but the question of a full ideal Christophany still remained unanswered. The Christological revelations of the Old Testament were incomplete without this. The ecstasy, or trance, could not serve this end, for that dealt only in scenical representations. Something was needed whereby the doctrine of Messiah should be brought

home more fully to the human sympathies. A scenical representation, like that of Acts x, 9-16, may present a grand apocalypse of the unfolding counsels of God; but an actual experience involving life, and interests dearer than life, would awaken clearer perceptions and profounder appreciations, and place the mind in a far more favorable attitude to receive truths congenial to its awakened sympathies. In the latter the senses are not closed, but intensely active, giving preternatural intensity to the mental operations. The highest form of Christological revelation in the Old Testament is not scenical representation, but historical enactment: not objective announcement, like the creation in the first verse of Genesis, or the Hebrew bondage in Egypt, (Gen. xv, 13-18,) but a subjective illustration, an illustration wrought out through the consciousness—the prophet, his condition, his mental states, his spiritual intuitions, his verbal utterances, all being invested with an ectypal significance. The historic present, replete with vast realities, becomes the penciling outline of the future, which the indwelling Spirit prophetically applies and explains.

And such must be the method, especially, in regard to that one profound mystery standing out upon the horizon of the dim future in distinct reality, and yet infolded in the "hidden wisdom of God" from the perfect search of even prophetic vision—the mystery of a suffering Messiah. How was this to be explained so that the idea of sufferings which stood alone, without example in the history of the universe, which "the angels" would "desire to look into," and at which heaven would stand awe-struck in reverent contemplation as all nature blushed and groaned and wrapped herself in sackcloth at the sight—how was the idea of such suffering to be lodged in the human mind a thousand years before its awful accomplishment? There were no historic analogues to serve as grounds of comparison, and yet the enveloped bud must be so far unfolded as to discover not only the flower and fruit, but its taste and life-giving properties. The bleeding victim upon the Jewish altar could not adequately foreshadow this truth. The foregleams of common prophecy could not clearly discover it. A Balaam might "take up his parable" and announce "there shall come a star out of Jacob, and a scepter shall rise out of Israel;" Jacob himself might foretell that "Shiloh should come;" and Moses

might declare to the people, "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me;" and far back into patriarchal times, upon "the mount of the Lord," Abraham might announce in mystic form, "Jehovah shall provide" a sacrifice; but still the question recurs, How shall some further, some more interior, subjective view of this veiled Calvary-scene be obtained? In the nature of the case but one method remained. Feelings can never be described by words, especially where men have had no experience of such feelings, and hence no words or metaphors to describe them. This *experience*, then—or something so far resembling it as to become a fit emblem or suggestive occasion of the Messianic sufferings—must be enacted. The prophet himself must go down into Gethsemane; he must be persecuted, arrested, reviled, condemned by heartless enemies, and by them dragged through the *via dolorosa* to Calvary. The idea must be scenically produced from a real experience, as the suggestive, historic occasion and emblem, through which the mind of the prophet is lifted up by the Holy Spirit to trace and to distinguish the far distant yet now clearly traceable and adorable prototype, a bleeding, agonizing, and dying Messiah. A trance, we say, could not suffice for the attainment of such knowledge. A verbal message, divinely given and faithfully delivered, could not meet the case. The prophet might, indeed, have been employed automatically to enunciate words, of the import of which he had no conception, and to describe scenes of which the world's history could furnish no resemblance; but this would be no revelation, and could furnish no help to the faith of the expectant ages.

The sufferings of Messiah related to the soul as well as to the body; to the soul more than to the body. How could sufferings resulting from dishonor, indignity, blasphemy, treachery, fear, sorrow, and the withdrawal of the light of Jehovah's face, be represented, or the ideas of them conveyed by words or dumb signs? The ideas of substitution—death for death—of expiation, pardon, and life, might be given by the death of a bullock or a lamb, or by the *azazel* or "scape-goat," with confession over the victim and the figurative transfer of guilt; but the mind of the spiritual worshiper still needed helps by which to be drawn nearer the throbbing heart, closer in sympathy with the person and office work of the great prototype, the true

Azazel, who should "bear away the sins of the congregation;" the real "Lamb of God," which should expiate the guilt of the world. Signs, or picture scenes, are of higher significance than words, but experiences transcend all forms of language as the substance does the shadow. The nearer, therefore, the actual circumstances and feelings of the prophet could approach in resemblance the circumstances and sufferings of Jesus—above all, that most mysterious of all, his soul-sufferings—the more perfectly, vividly, and minutely would he be enabled, through the revealing and inspiring Spirit, to apprehend and portray them. Still the force of the representation would not lie chiefly in the word-picture of the sufferer, but in the scene itself. Here, then, is indicated the demand for that highest use of the human faculties and human conditions in order to the revelation or unvailing of the deepest of the hidden mysteries of God: a state in which the senses are not closed, as in the dream or trance, but open, observant, and wrought up to the highest intensity of action, as helps to the mental conceptions and feelings; a state in which the prophet is subjected to a process of treatment, with a view at once to the highest development of intellectual activity and of passive sufferings, wherein the *sensibilities*, and especially the *moral* sensibilities, are made the grand medium of suggestion of truths which the inspired reason is enabled to discover and record.

In the light of these principles let us now return to the Twenty-second Psalm. Two facts, as we have seen, are therein set forth—the *sufferings* and the *triumphs* of the Redeemer. In both these conditions of *victim* and *victor* the prophet is a typical person; his circumstances are typical, his sorrows and joys are typical; historically real, but prophetically typical. The outwardness of things is arranged and adapted by divine Providence to induce a subjective state, or series of states, typical of the mental agony and exultation of Messiah in his redemptive conflicts and triumphs. This outwardness, or condition of the prophet, is the historic ground-work of the psalm, to which the attention of the exegete is first called, and from which he ascends to the main and ultimate object—its prophetic shadowings of the deep and awful exercises of the Redeemer's soul. If the psalm fail to bring the interpreter and reader into the inner chamber of the Saviour's soul, and

discover to him the class and quality of those feelings which entered into the very essence of atonement—feelings which borrowed their hues from the eternal destiny of human spirits—it fails of the grand intention of its Author.

It may not to all minds have the force of a demonstration, or of an undoubted certainty, that David was at Maon when he wrote this psalm, and that the events of that occasion are the same as are briefly recorded in 1 Sam. xxiii, 24–28; but the historic circumstances in favor of this hypothesis are such as to entitle it to a preponderating probability. It is conceded on all hands that he was in the greatest distress, straitened on every hand, utterly shut up and surrounded by his eager enemies, and far—hopelessly far—from any human help, and hence commentators generally turn their eyes to the dreadful days and nights at Maon. None of his perils and escapes seem to have made such a deep impression on his mind, for though the titles of some of his psalms, and the unmistakable allusions, tone, and drift of others, clearly enough point to the sad or joyful occasions of them, yet to none other of the “rocks” or “strongholds” of the desert of Judah, or elsewhere, which gave him a temporary refuge, did he give a memorialistic name. But to this of Maon he gave the strong title of סֵלָה הַמַּחֲלֵקוֹת, *Sela-ham-mahlekoth*, which, in the margin of our English Bible, following the current of the Jewish interpreters, is rendered, “*The Rock of Divisions*,” as if the allusion was to the *divided* mind of Saul, whether to pursue David, or turn back to protect his frontier against the invasion of the Philistines. But Gesenius, Davidson, and others more properly render it, “*The Rock of Escapes*,” and, indeed, here more narrowly than ever David escaped from his enemy. In either of the above renderings the perils of David, and the eagerness of Saul’s excited hopes of arresting him, are fully brought out. Here Saul had completely surrounded him, and the rocky cave where David lay concealed had no labyrinths for retreat as at Adullam and afterward at Engedi, while hour after hour the circling lines of Saul’s chosen thousands were cautiously advancing and closing in. Saul conducted the advance with more than customary military skill and caution, while David, like a hunted fawn, watched his movements and shifted his position from time to time, to elude discovery, and delay as

long as possible the fatal, dreaded, and impending crisis. The imagination must be left, with the few facts recorded in 1 Sam. xxiii, 24-28 and the Twenty-second Psalm, historically considered, to fill up the picture, if, indeed, any room be left for even the imagination to operate. The first twenty-one verses of that psalm, or, according to Dr. Horsley's division, (excepting a part of the second hemistich) of that verse must be supposed to have been written during the circumvallation by Saul's troops of the hill on which David was. These were hours of terror. The terrified muse of the prophet quivered like the timid kid before the lion's mouth. The perfidy, falsehood, baseness, and relentless cruelty of his arch enemy, surrounded as he was by equally cruel, reviling, and lying flatterers, all rose to view. Escape was humanly impossible. Saul would have given any thing less than his kingdom to satiate his spirit of bloody revenge. Like his great Prototype, David could almost say, "Father, the hour is come;" and to his enemies, "This is your hour and the power of darkness." True to his poetic and his prophetic destiny, he thought in measured verse and in prophetic significance. Himself the most illustrious progenitor of Christ, "a man after God's own heart," destined to represent the divine idea of a theocratic king, whose kingdom and dominion should become the truest type of Messiah's, his cause was the cause of God, his will the divine will. In his earlier writings is traceable a growing consciousness of an exalted destiny, the investiture of a divine vicegerency, and a corresponding oneness with God in heart and purpose. The developments of his history, and of the subjective realizations of his faith, were strikingly Messianic. This was his religious sphere. In him the Old Testament Christophany was to reach its zenith. He had early absorbed, in his inner life, the antecedent Christologies of his dispensation, and he was placed by Divine Providence, both in outward history and spiritual experiences, upon the line of genetic development of this great feature of prophetic revelation. At the moment of which we are now speaking he had reached that point in his religious development, and in his external condition and awakened sensibilities, to be fitly used by the Holy Spirit for the highest ends of prophecy. The images that filled his imagination, like the real causes of the sufferings of his soul, now became typi-

cal by a divine direction. The man, his sufferings, his enemies, the struggles and outgoings of his soul, his language, all became typical. Grounded in historic reality, his utterances, under the guiding suggestions of the inspiring Divinity, often so transcend that reality, though still retaining their naturalness, that the expositor is unable to account for them even by hyperbole or poetic license, but is forced to seek the true explanation where the New Testament has placed it, in the real history of another individual—the Lord's Anointed.

At the end of the twenty-first verse we may suppose the historic event recorded in 1 Sam. xxiii, 27, to have transpired. Saul was suddenly forced to relinquish his pursuit of David and return to protect his frontier. This event marks the transition in the psalm from the depths of distress, complaint, and peril, to the highest triumphs of joy and hope. The reader will better appreciate it by having the whole before his eyes. Adopting the suggestion of Bishop Horsley, then, as to the transposition of the second member of verse 21, the whole would stand thus :

- 20 Deliver my soul from the sword,
My darling from the power of the dog.
21 Save me from the lion's mouth,
And from the horns of the unicorns.

"And there came a messenger unto Saul, saying, Haste thee and come, for the Philistines have invaded the land." Saul hastily retires. David resumes :

- 22 Thou hast answered me !
I will declare thy name unto my brethren ;
In the midst of the congregation will I praise thee, etc.

The "Haste thee" of the messenger to Saul was God's haste in delivering David. The divine object is secured, the instrumentality of persecuting malice had served its providential end. The wine-press of anguish had been trodden, and it had emitted, at the cost of every thing but the heart's blood of David, the purest droppings of the costliest truth of the Old Testament dispensation—a touching, graphic, and most impressive Calvary scene. The resurrection and Pentecost immediately follow the crucifixion. So with David. Instantly,

—"As the light of the morning, when the sun riseth,
Even a morning without clouds,"

the song of triumph and praise succeeds, and David's reversed history becomes the lively emblem of Messiah's victory and kingdom.

Was all this an accident, or was it in pursuance of a divine plan of revelation? The consistent believer in revelation cannot hesitate for an answer. But could not David as well have written this psalm in the quiet seclusion of meditative life, either as a shepherd of Bethlehem, or as a loved and honored member of the royal family? We answer, "With God all things are possible." We cannot deny that it is possible for God to produce upon the human mind, while in a state of actual ease, honor, and safety, such feelings as would give spontaneous utterance to the words of the psalm in question, and through them to have attained glimpses of a suffering Messiah. But this is not in accordance with his well-known plan, as all historic analogy testifies, nor possible without setting aside the ordinary laws of the human intellect and sensibility. From Abraham (in his "*Jehovah-jireh*") to Malachi, the prophets rose to supernatural visions through the medium of their historic surroundings. Real objects and events, producing in the mind real feelings and ideas, became the ladder of ascent; and through and above this outwardness the mind reached the sublimest heights of prophetic vision. The "word" or "voice" of God, the angelic ministration, the "dream," the "vision," each had its place and use; but in the dynamics of revelation nothing superseded the historic occasion and ectype, or fully subserved its ends. No method like this could bring home to the realizations of the soul the pathology (so to speak) of Messiah's mysterious work. For this latter and kindred purposes, but this above all, the prophets were put upon a previous course of training, and in preparatory conditions, so that, like all poets, (for poetry is the home of prophecy, and they uttered their oracles in poetic style and measure,) and in conformity with the eternal law of correlation of thought and language, they might

—learn in suffering
What they taught in song.

ART. IV. — SOUTHERN RECONSTRUCTION.

ITS OBSTACLES, ITS PROGRESS.

At the close of our late civil war grave questions in statesmanship and in social science arose. Some of them were so new that the past furnished no precedents; so difficult, that all the accumulated wisdom of the age could not offer a ready solution. The perplexities were great, while the necessities were urgent. Something must be done, and done quickly. Under the circumstances, experimenting was the only way out of the difficulties, and this involved the possibility of running into still more serious embarrassments. From their limited knowledge and experience the purest and wisest of statesmen are liable to errors in theory and mistakes in practice; while modern politicians are quite as likely to blunder as the best of men. The questions for solution were not only delicate, involving the sensibilities, the prejudices, and the convictions of a great majority of the people, but they were also deep and far-reaching, touching upon every element of national prosperity. They took into their grasp more than the political and the economical; they included also the moral, the social, and the religious.

The sword, though it practically settles many great political questions, does not immediately change convictions. Overcome by a superior power, the conquered are not necessarily convinced that the cause for which they were contending is wrong. Their feelings may remain the same, though their condition and circumstances may have greatly changed. This was precisely the condition of the Southern people when the work of reconstruction began. They had been fairly beaten in the field. They had surrendered. Their army was disbanded, and they were at the mercy of their conquerors. Their love for the cause for which they had staked every thing was intense and absorbing when they entered into the struggle. It was the common inspiration which moved and sustained them in the conflict. At the close of the war that love had become more strong and intense by the sacrifices they had made and the privations they had cheerfully endured to secure their favorite object. Contending in this spirit, they

naturally came to hate the Government that was trying to subdue them as intensely and as passionately as they had loved their own political idol. That nature was not concealed, and it was shared by all classes, even by the women and children of the South, who did not hesitate to manifest it in all suitable, and in many unsuitable, ways. With this state of feeling at its height the war closed.

At this point their pride of character and of consistency came in. They not only loved the "lost cause," but they were determined to love it still, and to cling to it with their affections as long as life should last. They not only hated the Government, the power of their conquerors, and every manifestation and symbol of that power, but it was the settled purpose of their heart to continue to hate it in their inmost soul, even if they could successfully offer to it no active resistance. They had not sinned, they had not done wrong, they had simply been unsuccessful. They had no pardon to ask, no confession to make; they were not ashamed of either their cause or their course.* Why should their consciences condemn them when their spiritual guides, the leading ministers of all denominations, were with them, if not leading them, both in spirit and in opinion? In this the prestige of the Southern Churches was with them, so was the high-toned chivalry, as a unit; and last, but not least, the heart and sympathy and cordial support of their women.

These were the people, in 1865, to be reconstructed; to be returned to their allegiance to the Government which they did their best to overthrow; to be brought back into homogeneous relations with the general interests; and into sympathy with the national will as expressed through its constituted authorities.

The above, however, does not express the whole difficulty, nor indicate all the embarrassments of reconstruction. Many other complications entered into the question. Great changes had taken place in the four years of war. Four millions of

* Yet our contributor overlooks the fact that immediately after the surrender of General Lee the mind of the South was for a time humble and conciliatory. Bishop Andrews made deep and solemn confessions, and other Southern Bishops were for Church reunion. The tone of the Southern Methodist press was, for a brief period, right. But the politicians at length commenced their work, aiming at recovering political ascendancy over the country, and the spirit of 1860 revived.—ED.

slaves had been emancipated, and all the value at which their masters had rated them was forever lost. Along with these, hundreds of millions of other property had been destroyed. From so great a loss nothing, in their estimation, had been gained. Many of their illustrious men had fallen in the strife, the rich had been made poor, their country was full of widows and orphans, and all the substance of their land was devoured. All these things were mingled in their cup of grief. The newly-emancipated freedmen were to remain, for the most part, in the same section of country with their old masters. The slave had not been educated. It was not politic, it was against the law, to educate him. As a natural consequence the slaves, as a class, were greatly demoralized. The permitted customs of society tended still further to degrade them. They possessed a much larger development of the animal nature than of the moral and intellectual. They had been saved all the trouble and labor of thinking and providing for themselves and their families. Their masters had been more than willing to do this for them. As a general rule the native white population did not feel very kindly and sympathetically toward the freedmen as a class, especially at first. That was natural, almost inevitable. At least it should have been expected. It is a law of our nature that, under the most favorable circumstances, it takes time for excited feelings to subside, and for a great grief to pass away. It is not a wise policy, generally, to keep irritating the minds we wish to soothe, or to unnecessarily cross their feelings or to stir up their prejudices. The sensibilities of the Southern people at the close of the war were, and for a long time had been, unduly excited; they were in an abnormal condition, in a kind of diseased state. They needed wise counsel, considerate treatment, skillful practice. The political doctors who volunteered their services were not generally of this sort, nor at all in the confidence and sympathy of their patients. They often treated the case unskillfully, frequently prescribing irritants when sedatives would have been more appropriate. The result is, up to this time the disease is not cured; it has passed from the acute into the chronic state. The fever, though somewhat abated, more from the lapse of time than the effects of prescriptions, may still be detected by an unnatural pulse and a labored respiration.

They looked upon the freedmen as in some sense the cause of all their troubles. They wanted an independent confederacy, whose corner-stone should be slavery, that their "peculiar institution" might be no longer threatened or annoyed by Northern Abolitionists. Instead of protecting slavery and making it perpetual, as they fondly expected, every slave had been emancipated. The hated Abolitionists were triumphant, and a part of the spite which the South felt toward the emancipationists of the North they were at first disposed to vent upon the emancipated. They loved the freedmen less because the conquerors loved them more. Bleeding at every pore, and crushed by defeat, they saw their former slaves all jubilant with the excitements of a new-born freedom. The contrast was great on either side, and it is not strange that unkind feelings were sometimes manifested in their paroxysms of grief and sorrow. It is not wonderful even that a feeling of revenge, when not restrained by religion, frequently manifested itself in overt acts of violence.

There was still another excitant. They feared "social equality." That was an awful word among them; a powerful word, not of magic, to calm and soothe over-excited nerves, but a demoniacal word, to arouse and excite to their highest pitch their strongest, their deepest-seated, prejudice. This was a "harp of a thousand strings" on which both parties played, not for the purpose of casting out the evil spirit, but to excite to rage and madness spirits already within. Inconsiderate editors at the North, unwise newspaper correspondents and "carpet bag" orators of the baser sort at the South, for a long time kept the nerves of the South quivering with excitement over that question, until the Southern people could throw themselves at will into paroxysms of bitterness from which they did not seem anxious to be free. This fear, combined with other causes, led many at first to say, "We will not employ the negroes—let them shirk for themselves: let the Abolitionists take care of their pets." They had predicted often that the negro would not work—that he could not take care of himself—that in a state of freedom he would become utterly demoralized—that he would resort to thieving and robbing for a living, and that thus left to itself the race would gradually diminish, and finally become extinct. They must uncon-

sciously have felt a strong desire to prove themselves true prophets by the literal fulfillment of their predictions. Possibly, in some instances, there might have been a willingness to aid in bringing about an accomplishment of their frequent vaticinations.

They had been educated to believe that the negro is by nature an inferior being—some of them, that he descended not from Adam, but from some federal head of the monkey tribe, and therefore was incapable of cultivation and refinement—that it was sacrilegious to attempt to educate him and elevate him to the rights and privileges of citizenship. Their very soul, all their natural instincts and acquired feelings, revolted at the idea of placing the white and colored races on the plane of either social or civil equality. While the North believed this to be right, and the solemn duty of the nation to make it an accomplished fact, to the South it really appeared all wrong, and that it was their religious duty and privilege to oppose it. The honesty and depth of their convictions gave additional strength and persistence to their opposition. An error often committed at the North in judging the people at the South is, in not giving them credit for sincerity in their beliefs. Northerners forget that the people of the South look at many moral questions from a different stand-point, under the influence of a different education, through a different atmosphere, created by their divines and sanctioned by their most familiar religious authorities. And some of their greatest errors in philosophy and doctrines have over them all the force and authority of truths. A great point is sometimes gained when one concedes the sincerity of his opponent. As a general rule, probably with some exceptions, this concession should be given to the South.

With all these facts, convictions, and influences acting upon them, it was natural—it was almost inevitable—that the Southern people at first would oppose with great earnestness the elevation of the freedmen among them, either by education, citizenship, or the elective franchise. Time would be necessary to allow the heat of unnatural excitement to cool off, the strength of their prejudices to abate, their calm judgment and reason to return, in order to a proper view of the great political question in all its relations and interests.

Whether the Reconstructionists have adopted extreme measures, or pushed things with unnecessary haste, is a question which the writer will not presume to decide. The South having delayed to act promptly in the right direction in reference to the freedmen and Unionists in their several States, and by various overt acts, which were generally approved, or at least not openly and publicly condemned, showing that there was not a fair prospect of their acting up to the opportunities and responsibilities of the hour, the Thirteenth Amendment was enacted as a natural consequence of their *unwisdom*. Being still slow to come to time, the Fourteenth Amendment was enacted by Congress, and sent out for its ratification by the States. Still refusing to learn wisdom from the logic of events, they forced upon the nation the necessity of adding to the Constitution of the United States the Fifteenth Amendment, which is now a law, and one of the national statutes.

The South has had great opportunities. No conquered people was ever treated with so much leniency and with so great magnanimity by the conquering power. With a full appreciation of their situation, they might have accepted it in a truly loyal and noble spirit. Seeing the inevitable, they might have freely offered to yield what they could not retain, and thereby have won admiration by a becoming humility and true greatness of spirit. When their slaves were set free, they might have stepped forward and become the foremost advocates for their general education and proper elevation. They might have welcomed the Northern immigrant, when they saw his coming inevitable, in the truly hospitable spirit of the older Southern chivalry. But to all these opportunities pride, passion, prejudice, or a too intensified self-interest, had blinded them. Failing to perceive their grand opportunities, they failed to improve them. Thus their failures in peace were greater than their failures in war, and in the hands of the impartial historian will be more damaging to their reputation. They saw not the face of the angel approaching them, but only the back as he was leaving them for ever.

The work of reconstruction was still further embarrassed by their disposition to retaliate on those among them who had remained loyal to the Federal Government during the war. In many places there were such, and consequently hostilities were

carried into social life. Peace had come, but there was no harmony. Thenceforward was to be a broad line of distinction drawn between the former loyal and disloyal. The Jews were to have no intercourse, no dealings, with the Samaritans. There were to be no friendly greetings, no interchanges of social visiting, no reciprocity of refined courtesies. Southern ladies refused to take boarders into their houses from the North, no matter how worthy, intelligent, or refined they might be. It seemed to be a purpose universally understood and agreed upon by the friends of the "lost cause," to deny henceforth all social privileges to persons of the opposite party. They not only shut the door against Unionists coming into their fellowship, but they carefully guarded every avenue leading out, allowing no one to desert their ranks. It would require a person of uncommon nerve and courage, even if his convictions were in that direction, to pass from them over to the support of the Union cause. The severest anathemas would be thundered against his name; he would be expelled from their social circles and sympathies, and be despised and hated ever after far beyond the Northern loyal immigrant. That spirit continues to this day—a social despotism in the South as intolerable as it is unreasonable. That constitutes one of the greatest obstacles to the social and religious reconstruction of the South.

There is a rebellious idea called the "South," a purely imaginary fiction, which possesses over the Southern mind an extraordinary enchantment. It is made a high point of honor to be true and loyal to "the South." It is a social and moral treason to break from it; an offense for which their approved vocabulary contains no word of pardon. They judge of people and estimate their value by their devotion to "the South." This "South" is the Southern Confederacy sublimated and etherealized into an *idea* without a body, a form, or a fixed habitation, yet dwelling in the brain and cherished in the heart of millions as strongly as when its seat of government was supposed to be impregnable at Richmond.

There are now, however, thousands of people of the South, many of them intelligent and excellent, who would like to break away from their allegiance to this social despotism, but they lack the moral stamina to do so. They dread, either for themselves, their families, or their business, the persecution that

is as sure to follow them as the night is to follow the day. It is hard to begin. Of this, General Longstreet and ex-Governor Browne, of Georgia, have had ample experience. These cords, however, will give way by and by, and then there will be a rush from that fold. In the few years to come, death, with its busy fingers, will be thinning out the ranks of the stronger devotees, and after a few passing decades this unprofitable and imaginary "South" may become so powerless and poor that it will require the highest style of courage to dare to do it reverence. It cannot project itself forward more than a generation into the future.

The same spirit has invaded the sanctuary. Many have said they would not hear a Northern man preach, meaning, of course, one who sympathized with the Government. No matter how pious, how learned, how wise he might be; if his sympathies were with the North he would be disqualified for breaking to their pure and unpolitical souls the bread of eternal life. Their political animosities were stronger than their ecclesiastical affinities—the repulsions of prejudice triumphed over the attractions of Christian love. Precisely alike in doctrinal belief, they were perfect antipodes in spirit and feeling. Practically they changed the exhortation of the beloved John, "Let us love one another," into its opposite, "Let us hate one another." They gave occasion to the ungodly world to say, "See how these professing Christians hate one another." The plowshare of disruption has been ruthlessly driven through the most sacred, domestic, social, and religious ties, and broken up the good order and pleasant feelings of families, neighborhoods, and Churches. The strength of these animosities, and the extent of this social disorder in the South, as they have been manifested, cannot be properly understood by any description which may be given of them; they require contact, observation, experience.

The great question of reconstruction is not simply how to bring these revolted States back into a formal recognition of allegiance to the Federal Government, so as to have a due representation in both houses of Congress, but how shall be secured internal peace, mutual good feeling and sympathy, social harmony, religious unity, and spiritual prosperity? How shall the wounds of the war be healed; the animosities which

the rebellion engendered rooted up and removed; and how shall the streams of brotherly love and Christian fellowship be made again to flow into and fill their wonted channels? Such was the condition of the South, and such the important work to be done.

We come now to consider the progress of reconstruction. What has been accomplished in the intervening period of five years? Something has been done. It took a long time to begin, to get fairly under way, and even then progress was very slow. The lapse of five years has made its impression. Though there is still much bitterness of feeling, yet that bitterness has lost much of its intensity. It is impossible to retain hostility at fever heat by a simple act of the will. There must be some other fuel to keep up the fire. It is easy to see everywhere a general toning down, a gradual softening. Every disease has its natural history—a definite period in which to run its course—when, if the patient survives the treatment, it expires by limitation. Having spent its force and worn itself out, it finally disappears, leaving its victim in a convalescing state, unless poisoned by unsuitable medicine. So it has been, so it will be, in the South. This bitterness is passing away. It evaporated very slowly at first, but it is going more rapidly now, and its rapidity will increase with the lapse of time. Its bounds are fixed that it cannot pass. It will be impossible for the present generation to hand much of it down to the next. All the progress that has been made in the favorable change of feeling does not lie upon the surface, has not yet been fully brought to the light. This improvement must for the most part be set to the credit of time. Other agencies are at work, and are producing their legitimate effects.

It is a great pity that the religious convictions of the people, under direction of their spiritual guides, the clergy, do not take the lead of all other agencies in the proper reconstruction of the South. But as these guides sanctioned the rebellion, exhorted the people to enlist, and not unfrequently led them to battle, always praying for their protection and for the ultimate success of the Confederacy, it was hardly to be expected that they would suddenly change front, and be among the foremost in going back to their former allegiance. As a general rule the clergy are a very conservative body. They change

slowly, and when they have fairly taken a position supported by their convictions, they do not readily desert or surrender it. A natural politician will turn a dozen somersaults while a substantial clergyman is getting ready to adjust himself to new circumstances. The truthful historian will have to say that all those clergymen who plunged into the war, and went heart and hand with the rebellion, formed the extreme rear guard when it became necessary to bring the hearts of the people back to the Federal Government. General Pope said, in the autumn of 1867, while in command of his department of the South, with head-quarters in Atlanta, Ga., "that the greatest obstacles to reconstruction were the leading ministers and the women." It is a fact well known throughout the South that when the clergy ceased to pray for the success of the Confederate States they did not immediately begin to pray for the Federal Government. It is also a fact that but very few of them now pray in public with any degree of earnestness for God's blessing on "the powers that be." If they touch the subject at all it is with extreme brevity, and they seem to hurry on to something more congenial to their souls. They probably know, and that may be their reason for it, that as a general thing the people do not yet like to hear much prayer on that subject, much less to join in sympathy with it. The religious teachers of the South, in the true spirit of Christ, should have taken the lead in this great work, and Christianity should have become the most active and influential of all agencies in bringing about the needed reconstruction of society. But unfortunately it was not so, and that fact must go into history. It will prove an ugly fact to stare those ministers in the face hereafter, and a standing reproach to the Christianity which they professed to hold and represent. The skeptics and infidels of the next generation will not be slow to use this fact as against the divinity of our holy religion. How true it is that Christ is often wounded in the house of his friends. We do not imply here that the ministers of the South are not Christian men, nor that they have not in other ways been useful to the cause of religion, but simply that they missed their opportunity, and did not do as they ought to have done, in leading back a straying and estranged people to the harmonies, the fraternities, and the Christian fellowship of peace. Their

proper place was at the head of the returning columns; but they lingered in the rear.

At the close of the war, as has already been stated, the whites were not kindly in their feelings toward the colored race. Their first impulses were not to employ them. Their necessities, however, soon corrected this error. Many who needed the services of the freedmen on their farms and plantations, or as domestic servants, committed two great mistakes, which their experience afterward corrected. One was to exercise the old rigors of the days of slavery—to whip and abuse them generally. This was partly from the force of habit, and partly from the spite which they felt toward the race, in consequence of the success of the war in their general emancipation. The other was a refusal to pay them properly for their labor. There were many worthy exceptions to this rule, for there are truly noble and worthy people in the South, who dealt honorably and justly with their colored *employees*. Yet there were too many instances of the former kind. Such got along tolerably well for the first year, but when they wanted to hire laborers for their cotton plantations the next spring, there were none to be found willing to work for them. Their conduct the year before was remembered against them. There was logic enough in the negro to draw a very correct conclusion, and force of purpose enough to abide by it. The consequence was, that many old plantations were not worked that year, and the profits on the cotton that might have been raised, but was not, did not find its way in the shape of money into the planters' pockets. Here was a new idea to them, an important one, and very practical. Those who treated their laborers well the year before, and paid them according to agreement, had no difficulty in procuring all the hands they wanted. These things were to be seen in every neighborhood—each class of employers taught the other a lesson. Each could see the practical effect of the other's policy as well as his own, and learn wisdom for the future. It is now perfectly understood throughout the South, that if a man wants to carry on business next year, and needs suitable laborers, he must treat them kindly, and deal with them honestly this year. It is wonderful what an effect this simple truth has had on the planters, if we take their own confessions and declarations in evidence. It was not so much.

the moral force of high principle that brought them into normal relations with the laboring class, as it was a keen perception of their material self-interests. It was mammon rather than the spirit of Christ which led off here in the right direction.

The freedmen also had a practical lesson to learn. They were not, in the outset, all paragons of virtue and honesty. It would be a rash statement to affirm it of them now. They did not at first feel the binding force of a contract, and not unfrequently, after binding themselves to work the season for a stipulated price, they would leave and engage for some unscrupulous fellow for the merest trifle more than their first contract called for. When, misused afterward by the one that had decoyed them away, they went back to the party of the first part to be taken again into his employ, they found that they would not be received. Hence they would suffer for the want of one to employ them. There were many cases of this kind, but they are growing less and less every year. The freedman is learning morality and honesty by experience. Practical business, the mutual wants and necessities of capital and labor, are to-day doing more to reconstruct society in the South than all other agencies combined. These things have already done wonders, and are still exerting a powerful influence. They will work on, under favorable circumstances, until material interests are properly adjusted.

For a time many were indulging the hope that by some favorable turn in the political balances slavery in some form would be re-established. Hence they violently opposed the education of the freedmen, for that, carried far enough, would unfit them for any kind of servitude akin to slavery. They opposed citizenship and the elective franchise for the emancipated race. But since the final adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment became a moral certainty, more rapid progress has been making in reference to these things. "If the negro is to be a citizen and dwell among us, it is better," they say, "that he should be educated, especially if he is allowed to vote." As his citizenship and the privileges of voting and holding office, if he can get himself elected, are made sure by amendments to the Constitution, their opposition to his education is gradually giving way. Great progress has been made

in this direction, not only in the education of the colored people, through the agency of the Freedmen's Bureau, but especially in the favorable change of feeling in the white race on this subject. The feeling and purpose of that class, however, is still very strong, that the two races must be educated separately. This idea is quite acceptable to the colored people. They generally, almost universally, in the South, prefer to be by themselves. They especially prefer to have preachers of their own color, who know how to sympathize with them in all their peculiarities. This statement is made on the almost universal testimony of the colored people.

It may be well to state here that the whites much prefer to have the freedmen for labor, either for the house or in the field, to the foreigner, come he from whatever part of the world he may. That is the general sentiment. The talk of introducing the Chinese or Japanese into the South, or the emigrants from the north of Europe, will end where it began, in talk, so far as superseding the negro is concerned. They may come in large numbers; but the negro, after all—so kind, so polite, so obliging, so easily and so strongly attached to those who treat him kindly—will hold his place, and be the general favorite.

We have spoken of the progress of reconstruction only so far as bringing the white and colored races into practical, honorable, and friendly relations to each other, so that they begin to see clearly, and understand their mutual dependence and their mutual interests. Brought thus far by the principles of mutual self-interest, religion, education, philanthropy, and benevolence will come on after awhile, overtake the advancing columns under the lead of mammon's influence, and complete, in due time, the work so auspiciously begun. It is now time to speak of the feelings of the South toward immigrants from the north.

The feeling at first was very bitter. All sorts of threats were made against them. Bands of masked Ku Klux prowled over some portions of the country, whose purpose was in part to drive out those already here if their politics were not right—for that was their only cause of offense—and prevent others like them from coming. These fellows' hands are not innocent of blood. Many victims have fallen before their murderous

rage. A sad chapter the doings of those desperadoes will make in history. The retributive justice of God will doubtless overtake, in due time, all those who have thus imbrued their hands in innocent blood, and also all those who have directly or indirectly encouraged them, or secretly sympathized with their nefarious designs and deeds. Neither the garb of professional saints nor the clerical robes of the priesthood will shield the guilty in the day when God shall mete out to them their just deserts. Jehovah only knows how extensive and terrible has been the guilt of the aiders and abettors of this heinous crime, either before or after the fact. It will be hard for the historian to do justice to this subject, because so much of it is the work of darkness and of secrecy. Thousands upon thousands would not dare to confess before God or man the extent of their guilt from a secret sympathy with this infernal diabolism. But a better state of things has already dawned. The mists of the morning that is succeeding so dark and terrible a night are melting away before the rising sun. Mammon is lifting up the eyelids of the people, and they begin to see men as trees walking. They begin to discover their pecuniary interests. What a pity that religion, with its sweet voice and inspiration from heaven, should let this low principle of material self-interests lead the van in this part of the work of reconstruction !

After awhile the Southern people became aware of the fact that great stores of wealth lay concealed beneath their soil in rich beds of coal and iron, and various other kinds of ore ; that their soil was fertile, and capable of a vast increase of production ; that they had immense water-power on their great rivers and mountain streams, with unrivaled facilities for manufacturing purposes. But with all these unbounded resources and facilities, their lands were worth but a trifle compared with much poorer lands at the North. They saw, also, that they had neither the capital nor the skill to develop these resources and to establish large manufacturing interests. The North had the very things which they lacked and wanted. If the North would send down her capital and her skilled laborers, develop their mines, and improve the immense water-power in the South, every acre of land would soon more than treble and quadruple its value. This was a great idea, and a great temptation came with it. For the sake of increasing the facilities and wealth

of the country the proud Southron proposed to lay aside to some extent his prejudices, and invite immigration from the Northern States or from Europe. The right chord of sympathy was now touched, the key-note was sounded, and the grand chorus began. Conservative editors all over the South began to change gradually their tone from fierce opposition to silence or qualified approval, until to-day they are loudly clamoring throughout the length and breadth of the "Sunny South" for the immigrant to come and bring his skill and his money with him. This is great progress toward reconstruction. The middle wall of partition is tumbling down, and you might hear many a stroke from a Southern hammer more or less vigorously applied to hasten its entire removal. All this in spite of Congressional acts and interference; in spite of political specifics and panaceas; in spite of much of the lusty preaching from Northern pulpits. It comes mainly from the natural development of forces inherent in Southern society, which become more and more disengaged and free as passion, prejudice, and bitterness subside.

Some of the people are much more advanced in this improvement than others. The less excitable and the more intelligent take the lead. The more clearly they see things, and the farther they can look into the future, the more practical and reasonable they become. The impulsive and the ignorant lag behind. Some cities and communities are more forward than others, but the solid phalanx is broken—the line wavers and bends forward in places; there is motion and commotion preparatory to a grand forward march. The cords which bound them down and held them back are giving way, and the progressive movement will be constantly accelerated.

There is another hopeful indication. As the intensity of bitterness evaporates from the Churches—for much of this bitterness, to their shame be it said, was in the Churches, and a great deal still remains in them, but it is gradually softening down and disappearing—we repeat, as this intensity of bitterness evaporates from the Southern Churches, a consciousness of their spiritually demoralized condition, caused by the war, is leading them to desire and pray for revival. Many of them are entering into this work in downright earnestness. They are asking, and they will doubtless receive; they are seeking, and will probably

find. Now if, even at this late hour, the spirit of a general revival shall be poured out upon them from on high—if the true spirit of Christ, in its fullness, ever enters their hearts—the Christian people of the South, headed by their ministers, will spring to their place in the front, and taking the leadership out of the hands of Mammon, will speedily bring this work of religious and social reconstruction to a happy consummation. There is the sound of a going forth in the tops of the mulberry-trees. There are signs of abundance of rain. May the Lord speed and preside over its coming! This we desire, and this we hope; yet much of it is of the nature of prediction, and may not be fulfilled.

Thus far progress seems to be destitute of the higher virtues. It is not of pure choice, nor desired for its own sake. It is complied with as a disagreeable means for a more desirable end. Hence, as a general rule, they have taken no steps in advance thus far, except as they were driven by their necessities. They may not feel complimented by this remark, which is made not for the purpose of reflecting upon them, but purely for the sake of historic truth. While they have come into more friendly and practical business relations with the freedmen, because they need their services; and while they present a more tolerant side to people from the North, because they want the benefit of their capital and mechanical skill, they still keep up an almost unbroken Chinese wall around their "Southern Society." The following extracts, taken from the *Franklin Repository*, from an article recently contributed by Colonel A. K. McClure, and dated Columbia, S. C., though professedly descriptive of things only in that State, is nevertheless, with but very few and rare exceptions, true of the whole South so far as family intercourse is concerned:

The people do not war upon Northern men with violence, but, as is most natural, they will war upon the Northern emigrant in a thousand ways. They will shun him socially; they will avoid his place of business; they will not employ him; in short, they will render him only civility and deal with him only from necessity. Between the Northern people and the natives there is an impassable social gulf. A few Southern men lament it, but not one, as far as I know, has been able to open his doors to the most reputable Northern visitors and welcome them to his fireside and family. The attrition of business interests and intercourse gradually makes Southern gentlemen sociable, but their families are beyond the reach of reconstruction. Congress may practically

reconstruct the men of the South, but what power exists sufficient to the task of reconstructing the Southern women? When this problem is solved, the work of reconstruction can be completed. The solution is a question of years. How long it may take depends upon the measure of Northern immigration. Northern capitalists are now gradually possessing the Southern railroads. Factories will follow, and employ the fine water-powers and cheap labor so abundant here. Farmers will sell their Northern farms at \$50 to \$150 per acre, and buy equally fertile lands, with the most inviting climate, for from \$5 to \$15 per acre, and Northern mechanics must come to keep pace with Northern progress. Northern merchants will settle in Northern communities, which will have Northern schools and teachers, and Northern Churches and Pastors; and necessity will make the Southerner advance. The present generation will move slowly, but the next will be glad to accept Northern ways and respect Northern energy. The hope of the South is in Northern immigration, and the sooner it comes the sooner will the blessings of peace and prosperity heal the wounds and restore the desolate places of the sunny South.

This exclusion of Northern families and individuals from their social circles was partly from prejudice and dislike, and partly as a stroke of policy. They seemed to think that Northern people could not be contented to remain among them if not admitted into their "society." And as at first they did not wish them to come, or, if they came, to stay long, hence their exclusion. They have learned, however, two things: first, that the South greatly needs, and will suffer financially for the want of, Northern immigration; secondly, that Northern people can get along in the South very comfortably even without the exalted privileges of their social reciprocity. They find other ways to occupy their minds and improve their time besides running from house to house, making and receiving calls. The South find by observation that the imported Northern society can get along and flourish quite as well without them as they can without it. So far as their motive for exclusion sought to discourage immigration, it will have to be given up as utterly futile and useless.

Their fancied dislike to Northern society is founded entirely on ignorance, and prejudices growing out of that ignorance. When that ignorance shall have been removed by opportunities of closer observation, as it soon must be, the prejudice which grew out of it will soon give way. There are not a few sensible women in the South who do not approve of this social

exclusiveness, and will in a little while begin to break away from it. In a few places this work has already begun to show itself. We may look in the next few years for a great improvement in this direction. The South will yet rise above the influence of necessity to the doing from pure choice of worthy and noble things.

Human nature at the South is quite as good as at the North. When you get down through public sentiment, through the biases of education, and the influences of prevailing fashions and customs, that nature is about the same every-where. The human natures that were raised at the North, even in the State of Massachusetts, when long transplanted to this Southern soil do not become any more beautiful in form, or more fruitful in good works and noble principles, than the natures that are native to the soil. There is often a marked difference between the two classes, not often much to the credit of the importation. To err is human, and any people yet discovered, though in error, do not like to be brought to the right path by denunciations, or by what they regard as abusive measures. Force applied in this way, however well intended, usually develops the unamiable qualities of our common humanity. We all prefer to be kindly dealt with, to be first convinced of our errors, and then affectionately won back to ways of peace and righteousness. There is a world of wisdom and philosophy in this declaration of the Saviour: "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." If God cannot bring men to Christ by any other than a winning and a drawing force, ought we to expect that God will, or that we can, draw others into kindly and just relations with ourselves or with each other by harsher and less acceptable instrumentalities? The Southern people have done many things that are wrong, things which hereafter they will be sorry for and ashamed of, but they did them under an awful pressure of excitement. They were a long time in a state of training by their leaders for this. It was the result of an education and of a growth in which the people generally were the victims, rather than the responsible instigators. As that was slowly coming on, it must not be expected to pass quickly away. In this, human nature will obey its established laws. Yet it will pass away, and the people of the South will yet in due time come out of their ex-

citement and abnormal condition, and manifest as truly noble traits of character as Christianity has ever* developed in any people. Then let us extend toward them not only forbearance and sympathy but also Christian courtesy and charity; and kindly use the more winning means and Christlike methods to bring them back into all the harmonies of peace and of social and Christian fellowship.

ART. V.—THE EARNEST *VERSUS* THE EASY MINISTER.

"THE age demands an earnest ministry." This is the language often heard from the pulpit and the pew, from the religious and secular press of the Christian world. And it is true. But it may be said that what is true of this, has been true of every age. Man's moral or spiritual wants are substantially the same in every age and in every place. He exists in every age as a sinner. But he exists as a redeemed sinner, surrounded by the vast remedial agencies which the infinite love of the infinite God has provided, and with all the mighty possibilities of his being within his grasp.

But *we* have especially to do with this age. This, with all its surroundings, is emphatically our day. And in many respects, it differs from all the ages which have preceded it. The dawn of the nineteenth century witnessed the inauguration of a new era in the history of human progress and destiny. The application of steam to the propulsion of the vessel and train—and later, of electricity to the transmission of human thoughts—has changed the whole face of the civilized world, and well-nigh annihilated both time and space. But along with these discoveries other mighty agencies have been brought into existence, looking to the elevation and the evangelization of the world. Missionary, Bible, Tract, and other societies have been organized, which are dotting the world with mission stations, scattering the leaves of the Bible and religious truth almost as thick "as leaves in Vallambrosa," and causing the silver trumpet of the Gospel jubilee to sound among all the hills and valleys of the world. Responsive to this call, startled by

the clang of this trumpet, the nations have suddenly changed their slow-paced march into a quick step.

Old forms of thought and action are disappearing in the dim distance; the lingering mists and clouds of mediæval darkness are flying before the light; thrones of despotism and tyranny have crumbled into dust; millions of serfs and slaves have "leaped to lose their chains;" the crescent pales before the light of the cross; idol-gods are falling from their niches and pedestals; and the great currents of human affairs are rushing on with a rapidity and an impetuosity never before witnessed.

The whole world is seething. The activities of the human mind were never before so fully developed, and thought is striking out on every line and in every direction. Hydra-headed infidelity is hissing on every side, breathing out its poisonous breath, and endeavoring to twine and tighten its coil around the fair form of our holy Christianity. Romanism, dying at the heart, but vigorous in its extremities, is striving to grasp in its iron clutch both Protestant England and Protestant America. These, and a thousand other things, give emphasis to the cry with which this article begins.

What, then, are the grand characteristics of the earnest minister which the age demands? Before entering directly upon the attempt to answer this question—and we can do nothing more than attempt an answer—we would premise, that if there is any thing in the universe in which man should be in earnest, it is in "the ministry of reconciliation." The Son of God himself has condescended to set all his ministers "an example that they should follow his steps." His three years of ministries to the people whom he came to redeem have furnished the most amazing records of labor which this world has ever read. But what has been recorded were only specimens of those labors, and do not present us with more than a tithe of them. It was true of him, as the Prophet declared, that "the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up."

The Apostles endeavored to tread in the footsteps of their divine Lord, and the records of their toils, which we possess, have astonished the great heart of the world for eighteen centuries. And all along those centuries there have been those, too few, alas! who have attempted to imitate their example, and, like the stars which "shine for ever and ever," they shed

their lustrous light on our path. It is in the light of these examples that we may clearly see who is the earnest, and who only the easy, minister.

As earnestness is demanded in every department of the minister's work, there is required, as the basis of all this work, *earnestness in his personal piety*. He may have vast and varied learning, splendid accomplishments, a fine and finished address, but without this "the root of the matter is not in him." The great work of the minister is to save men; which includes not merely bringing them to Christ, but also building them up in Christ. Now he who has not been saved himself knows not how to save others. He who has never known and felt the deep depravity of his own heart, who has never trembled under the burden of his sins, who has never felt himself going down into the boiling abyss of destruction, who has never felt the mighty hand of Jesus lifting him up and placing his feet firmly upon the rock, and who has never felt the power of the sprinkled blood upon his soul, is in no way prepared to direct, and help, and instrumentally save, others who are perishing. There must then be *reality* in his piety if there is earnestness in it. If there is any one thing which the men of this generation hate more than another it is sham, or hypocrisy—the semblance without the substance of godliness; the outside show without the inward life; the skeleton form without the living spirit. Painted flames will never warm the cold heart of this world; painted bread will never satisfy its hunger; and painted streams will never slake its thirst. Men ask, aye, they demand that the minister's piety should be real. If they have any thoughts at all about their souls; if the shadows of coming death and eternity come occasionally flitting over their souls and awakening their fears; if they pause for awhile amid the bustle of this world's cares and pursuits, and listen to the roar of the billows of the eternal ocean as they break just at their feet; they want some one who is able to tell them how to be saved, and whose character and example, as well as his teaching, will lead them to Calvary's cross and to the gates of pearl. Fashion, pride, the prejudices of education, social position, or family influence, may lead men to attend upon a ministry of another class, or to stay away from the sanctuary of God altogether; but ask any honest and intelligent worldling as to the character of the min-

ister whom he loves to listen to, and he will answer unhesitatingly, the man of earnest, warm, living piety. Perhaps the greatest danger to such a piety is the temptation, so often presented to the minister, to settle down into mere routineity, or into a professional performance of his duties. This must be guarded against with the most constant watchfulness and care; for if this temptation is yielded to, then he will be shorn of his strength, and become weak as other men.

But not only must the piety of the minister be real; his consecration to his great work must be entire and life-long. We presume it may be truthfully said, that every minister is tempted more or less, at some period of his life, to turn aside from his work and engage in some other employment. His temptation, too, often derives great strength from the difficulties and embarrassments which he meets in the prosecution of his work. His support is often meager, and entirely inadequate; his successes are not commensurate with his expectations; his labors are often unappreciated and uncoöperated with by those whose help he needs; and no one but his own heart and his God knows the fearful struggles through which he often passes. When thus assailed, were not his convictions of his call from God to this work clear and undoubted—were he not anchored to it by his vows of entire consecration—he would abandon his post and engage in other pursuits.

We would not say here that there are *no* circumstances which would warrant a minister from engaging in secular employment for the maintenance of himself and his family. Such a statement, if made, would be in the face of Paul's tent-making in Corinth and other places, and of the course pursued by many of our early fathers in the ministry. But this we will say, that when a man has vowed before God's altar, in the presence of angels and men, that he will "devote all his time" to the work of the ministry, nothing but the sheerest necessity should induce him to leave it. That necessity may arise from the prostration of his health; from the utter inadequacy of his support, or other equally pressing causes, but not from motives of comfort, ease, convenience, or wealth. It is, indeed, a pitiful sight—one at which worldlings "laugh in their sleeve" and at which Christians are sorrowful and ashamed—to see a man once mighty in the ministry turning from it to engage

in some lucrative employment, whether it be commercial, agricultural, or insurancial. A half minister and a half farmer, or half business man, or half agent, will never accomplish much for God and for humanity, however much he may accomplish for himself. Such ministers, if they would listen, would hear the voice of God speaking to them as it did to the pusillanimous prophet in the desert, "What doest thou here, Elijah?"

It has sometimes happened in the past, that when a large landed property or money has been acquired in marriage by the once earnest minister, he has turned aside, like Demas, and degenerates into a mere land agent, or a dealer at the stock board. But in opposition to all this, the Church and the world demand entire devotion to this one great work, making every thing else subordinate and subsidiary thereto. Any divergence from this weakens the influence of the minister, cripples his energies, tones down his zeal, chills his ardor, and makes him proportionally inefficient.

Here, then, is the true basis as well as the real secret of the character of the earnest minister.

Now, then, if the one who engages in this work possesses this character for piety, this entire consecration to the work, in connection with the inward call of the Holy Ghost and the outward call of the Church, he is to be *earnest in his preparation for it*. This we regard as true in a twofold sense: first, if there is the opportunity before engaging directly in it, he is to make use of every means within his reach to qualify himself for it; and, secondly, after having entered upon it, he will find that it will require his utmost and constant endeavors to show himself "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." As to the amount of intellectual culture requisite for engaging in the work of the ministry, there can be no fixed standard which will apply to all candidates. One thing, however, is clear to all minds, that the minister of Christ cannot possess too much knowledge, cannot be too thoroughly trained.

A new era has dawned upon our Church in the establishment of theological schools for the training of young men, who are, acknowledgedly, called of God to the work of the ministry. What the results of these schools and the training in them will be, remains to be seen. So far as our own denomination in

this country is concerned, they are an experiment. They have for a long time been employed by our sister Churches, and the results have not been always satisfactory to many of their leading ministers. For our own part, we "rejoice" over their establishment among us "with trembling." We have all confidence in the men who are now in these institutions as instructors and guides of our young men. May such men always be in these positions! But if ever the time should come, which may God forbid! when mere intellectual training shall be regarded, in any sense or to any degree, as a *substitute* for the baptism of the Holy Ghost, then, so far as their influence would go, spiritual darkness and death would overspread our Churches. The Church, doubtless, needs educated men, men of large and varied knowledge. She has always had them, and she always will have them. But we must never lose sight of the fact that heart-culture, spiritual power, the all-might of the Holy Ghost, *must be had*. Let the man, then, called of God to this work, avail himself of all the helps within his reach, whether from books, academies, colleges, or theological seminaries; but, above all, let him come to this work with his lips and his heart touched with the "living flame."

And not only so; after he has engaged in it, he will need to prosecute his studies, to add continually to his stores of knowledge, that he may keep pace with the ever-advancing march of intelligence, and draw from his heart-treasure "things new and old." The preparation for the pulpit, the prayer-meeting, the class-room, and the Bible-class is an ever on-going work. It admits of no suspension, no carelessness or indifference. Week by week and day by day it comes pressing home upon the heart of him who stands in Christ's stead to do Christ's work. The oil which he prepares for the sanctuary should be "beaten." The aliment which he provides for immortal beings perishing with hunger should be such as will satisfy their cravings. It may be easier, from very scanty materials, to produce, by much physical exertion, a sort of whip-syllabub; but this will not meet the felt wants of dying men. Hence the earnest minister not only reads, but "searches the Scriptures." And as a consequence his sermons, his addresses, his prayers are full of the words of God. Indeed, what else has he got to speak but this?

He is a "watchman," whom God has placed upon the walls; and what is he to do? He is to "hear the word" from the mouth of God, and to warn the people from him. He is a "witness for Christ;" and what is he to say? He is to testify as to what he has learned, and felt, and known of him. He is a "teacher," sent forth by the great Head of the Church to "teach all nations;" and what is he to teach? That they should "observe all things whatsoever he has commanded." He is an "ambassador," and what is he to say to those to whom he is sent? Only what he has been before instructed to say. He will not regard that any words of his own will have more interest, more weight, or more power than those which the Lord of heaven has given to him. How did the great Apostle regard this question? Writing to the Corinthians, he says, I "came to you, not with excellency of speech or of wisdom." But he could have come thus if he had so willed. Again: "My speech and my preaching were not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power." Further on he says: "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." Perhaps one of the most hopeful signs of the pulpit in the present day is the attempt being made by many of our earnest ministers to introduce expository preaching, in one service at least, upon the Sabbath. O how often, when the people have come to the house of God asking for bread, they have received nothing but a stone! It is utterly useless to say, that if we are "shut up" to the word of God, the people will become weary with hearing the same truths over and over again. This thought, which perhaps rarely finds utterance from the lips, is, we fear, often in the hearts of some ministers, and hence the resort to all manner of far-fetched themes to attract people to the house of God. But the earnest minister has faith in the adaptation, the fullness, and the power of the Gospel. He sees in the Gospel not only infinite depths, but also an infinite variety. Like the Bishop of Meaux, in the time of the Reformation, he can say of the Bible, "All the eyes in the world cannot take in the light of that sun." Hence, while the infidel of the rationalistic school is saying that "the Gospel is old and effete, that it has done its work, and must now pass away before the brighter light of progress and social science,"

he clings to it still as "the power of God and the wisdom of God." The infidel might as well say that the sun is an old sun, and the stars are old stars, and that the time has now come to blot them out of the heavens and light the world with rush-lights or with gas. No; the same God who made the sun and moon and stars to light our path by day and by night has given the Bible, the only sun which throws its light upon eternity, to be a "lamp to our feet and a light to our path." For six thousand years men have been engaged in studying the wonders of creation around them; and for thousands of years men have been studying God's word. And yet how little is known of either? So the earnest minister has no fears of exhausting the Bible. The study of such a minister is something more than a name. All the stores of knowledge within his reach will be diligently explored in the accumulation of material with which to enrich his sermons, and to feed the flock committed to his care. Each day, as it returns, will witness him poring over the sacred page, digging into the exhaustless mines of God's words. And then, after all studies, and mingling with all studies, prayer, mighty, prevailing prayer, will ascend from his heart to heaven for the outpouring of the Spirit upon himself and upon his people. Every minister's study should be a Bethel, whose walls, furniture, and books, could they speak, would tell of the struggles and the communings of his soul with God, and his earnest efforts to become a "vessel unto honor, sanctified and meet for the Master's use, and prepared unto every good work." Rutherford could say to his people at Anworth: "There I wrestled with the angel and prevailed. Woods, trees, meadows, and hills are my witnesses that I drew on a fair match betwixt Christ and Anworth."

With such a preparation for his work, when the man of God appears in the sacred desk his profiting will appear unto all men. The whole energies of his soul will be concentrated in his sermon. Before him he sees hundreds of immortal beings; many of them are out of Christ, blinded by sin, hardened by unbelief, and wending their way down to the darkness of endless night. He has now the opportunity to speak to them from God. Before another Sabbath some of them may be in eternity, or he may be summoned to render up his account. Faithful to his promise, Christ is with him, with his "all

power in heaven and earth" to aid him in his work. Angels are thronging the assembly, glad to join in its ministries. Upon the lips of God's chosen ambassador the live coal has been laid, and the Holy Ghost is girding him with his almighty energy. He is standing in Christ's stead, and a beseeching God is his example.

Given, then, all these conditions and surroundings, did ever man speak with such incentives to earnestness and zeal? Eloquent he may not be, in the general acceptance of that word; the graces of oratory may not be his; his lips may not have been wet with "Castalian dews;" but earnest he is, he must be, and every look of his eye, every gesture, every feature of his countenance, every word will show the mighty movements of his inspired soul. It is man that speaks, but God is speaking through him. It is man who preaches, but it is in the "demonstration of the Spirit"—it is "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." All this is very different from rant, or mere physical exertion. Nor can any one successfully imitate it. The fire must be in the heart, or it will not glint in the eye or glow on the features. The Holy Ghost must be in the soul, or the sermon will be only an empty sound.

Let us now follow the earnest minister into his pastoral work. No man is more than half a minister who does not attend to his pastoral work. To this he stands solemnly charged by the command of God, by the example of the great Apostle, and his solemn vows made at the altar of the Church when he was set apart for this great work. Writing to Timothy, the Apostle says: "I charge thee before God, preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." And not only so, he gives us his own illustrious example. This is nowhere presented more forcibly than in our Book of Discipline, page 80:

O let us herein follow the example of St. Paul! 1. For our general business, "Serving the Lord with all humility of mind." 2. Our special work, "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock." 3. Our doctrine, "Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." 4. The place, "I have taught you publicly, and from house to house." 5. The object and manner of teaching, "I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears." 6. His innocence and self-denial herein, "I have coveted no man's silver or gold." 7. His patience, "Neither count I my life dear unto my-

self." And among all other motives, let these be ever before our eyes: 1. "The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." 2. "Grievous wolves shall enter in; yea, of yourselves shall men arise, speaking perverse things."

That whole section (the ixth) might be read by all our ministers every day with great profit.

The great design of God in the call of his ministers, we conceive, cannot be answered unless they attend to the pastoral work. No public address can be expected to reach every heart or be adapted to every case. And then, it is only by personal acquaintance, and by personal conversation, that we can learn what are the wants of the people, and know how to address them. Then, too, there is a bond of sympathy established between the pulpit and the pew which nothing else can form. It is easy to form and plead excuses for non-attendance to this work. There are, doubtless, difficulties and embarrassments in the way of its performance. But, if we are right in our judgment, the minister has no right to plead excuses for neglecting it. His *duty* is plain. The responsibility of this work is upon him, and he cannot shake it off. The only one who can excuse him is the great Head of the Church. Has he done so? Will he do so? The really earnest minister, we think, will neither seek nor desire excuses, nor to be excused from it. He will go about this work, and do it, in the spirit of his Master by the aid of the Holy Ghost. He has time for it, because he is in earnest in all his work. He has adaptation for it, because he has the spirit of Jesus; and difficulties, dreaded by others, vanish from his way. When Dr. Wayland had resigned the presidency of Brown University, which position he had so ably occupied for twenty-eight years, he was invited to take charge of the First Baptist Church in Providence. Having accepted the invitation, he entered upon his duties, resolved not only to carry out his ideas of Gospel preaching, but also his long-cherished and earnestly-expressed views of pastoral visitation. We select a few extracts from his very valuable memoirs. He writes: "By the visiting needed, I do not mean a mere call of civility to inquire into the health of parents and children, and to manifest a neighborly regard for their welfare. This is scarcely the business of men charged with matters of grave importance. The visiting to which I

refer, is that which has for its end exclusively the spiritual good of those to whom it is made. This I attempted to carry on. I resolved that I would visit no house without introducing the subject of religion as a personal matter, and that in every case, unless it was manifestly best to omit it, I would pray with the family." He entered upon the work at once, and completed the thorough visitation of that large Church within a year. When he entered a family, he says further: "After the first incidental conversation I addressed the persons directly, and inquired into the prospects which they had for eternity." He would ask the questions: "What does your hope rest upon?" "How are you living?" and "What are you *doing* for Jesus Christ?" All this he accomplished when he was advanced in life, at the age of sixty-two, and amid many infirmities. Such a record is enough to put many of us who are younger to the blush, and to send us to our knees in penitence and prayer.

The language of our "Book of Discipline" is emphatic upon this point. "We must, yea, every traveling preacher *must* instruct the people from house to house." No one, therefore, should enter the ministry with any mental reservations on this subject. If he is satisfied that he *cannot* attend to this work, or resolved that he will not, let him turn his attention to some other employment. For he will only be part of a minister, no matter how eloquently he may preach, or how popular he may be in the pulpit, unless he is a faithful pastor.

It is easy for us to understand that a man who is thus thoroughly in earnest in the several departments referred to will be alive to every interest affecting the prosperity of the cause of Christ and the well-being of humanity. In all the mighty moral movements of the age, in all the benevolent enterprises of the Church, his whole soul will be deeply interested. In all these things he will not be prompted by unholy ambition or by selfish motives, but simply by the desire to glorify God and bless and save men. And O how much a man may accomplish for God and humanity whose whole soul is thus bent upon his work! Look at the work which Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and our fathers in the ministry, have accomplished! By their sermons, their books, their labors in the various departments of Christian effort and philanthropy, they have left their impress upon the ages; they have filled the world with songs of jubi-

lee; and they have peopled heaven with millions of a blood-washed tenantry. True, all ministers may not be able, either intellectually or physically, to perform the same kind or the same amount of labor, or to secure the same wonderful results; but all may follow after the deep foot-prints which those have made in their triumphant career from earth to glory. Now we say that this age demands such a ministry. The Church needs it. The wants of a perishing world plead earnestly for it. And the voice of God from his throne, and the voice of the great Head of the Church, and the inward voice of the Holy Ghost, command every minister to this work.

And yet it is painfully apparent that many are heedless to these calls. We will grant, what we most heartily believe to be true, that, on the whole, no country on the globe has ever had, from its very infancy until now, such a ministry for earnestness, zeal, and efficiency as our own has possessed. The ministry of America have, under God, saved it from barbarism, and raised it up to the very first rank among the nations of the earth. And the ministry of no Church have done so much toward this result as our own. That ministry have followed up the ever-westward movement of our surging population; have swam rivers, forded streams, penetrated wildernesses, climbed mountains, waded through swamps, preached in log-cabins and barns, in the woods, on the mountains, in the valleys, undaunted by dangers and undeterred by difficulties.

Great and glorious have been their successes! And we would that the mantles of our heaven-ascended fathers might be caught up and wrapped around all their sons in the ministry. But after all this is granted, is it not true that there are in our own, and in the ministry of other Churches, many who may well be called *easy ministers*? Great as the results referred to have been, might they not have been multiplied tenfold—aye, even a thousand fold—if all had possessed the earnestness and the energy of the few? And is there not some ground for the fear that now, as the wealth of our Church is increasing, and we are a “respectable” people, and salaries are annually growing larger, and the comforts of our ministers are multiplying, for all of which we are grateful—and which, instead of effeminating our ministry, should only stimulate us to new and more vigorous exertion—there will be a growing tendency to make

the office of the minister a mere sinecure? We trust that such a fear is groundless.

But let us now turn our attention more directly to the easy minister. If we mistake not, such a man has low views of personal piety, and of the character and design of his call to the ministry. It is to be supposed that at some period of his life he was converted and called of God. But the glowing ardor of his "first love" has been chilled, and the tremendous responsibilities of his calling are practically ignored. He may be a "good sort of a man," but he is certainly very easy about religion. He is an utter stranger to the higher walks of the Christian life, and is too indolent or too indifferent to reach them, or is unwilling to make the sacrifices necessary to tread them. He is very fearful of being considered "righteous over much," and rather boasts that "he makes no pretensions to great piety." He would rather stand at the base of the mountain, the heights of which others are scaling, and question, and criticize, and dream, than climb its rugged sides and stand upon its sunny summits. He spends but little time in prayer, and that is unaccompanied by "strong cries and tears" for himself and his flock. He has no *longings* for the salvation of souls. If they are saved under his ministry, well; if not, why, it is their own fault, and they must bear the consequences. He is not going to spend sleepless nights over them and anxious days, not he. It is enough for him to go through the routine of duty without troubling himself about others. He will preach, but he does not *beseech*. As his own heart is cold, his efforts are cold, dull, freezing. They may, indeed, be beautiful, "faultily faultless, icily regular," but they are also "splendidly null." The people are neither roused, nor warned, nor fed by his soulless productions. If his congregations decline, as they probably will; if his prayer-meetings are slimly attended; if the class-meeting is well-nigh abandoned; every one else, he thinks, is to blame but himself. Surely he is doing every thing which the people can reasonably expect of him. But the people among whom he labors, or rather rests, think if he was only more in earnest, more godly, more filled with the Spirit, things would be very different. There are, we think, but few Churches so afflicted with such ministers as one we have heard of, which, when the time of their pastor had

expired, asked the appointing power, more in earnest than in jest, "to send them a *converted* man, or at least one who was religiously inclined."

The preparations of the easy minister for the pulpit are soon and hastily made. Perhaps during the first few years of his ministry he has made one or two hundred skeletons, and they remain, dry and musty, as his only stock in trade for a ministry of twenty or thirty years. These skeletons are like the bones which Ezekiel saw in vision in one respect, although unlike them in another. They are "very dry," but they are not "very many." But he has rattled those thinly-clad skeletons so frequently before the people, that they fail to be either interested or startled by their noise. In fact, at each succeeding effort the effect of this performance sensibly decreases, as the preacher has less taste and strength to rattle them, and the people have less patience to listen to the noise. Or he may have procured one or two volumes of "sketches," containing the dry bones of other men, and these furnish him with frames upon which he hangs his scanty and threadbare thoughts. Now there can be no doubt at all in the mind of the thoughtful man that these "volumes of sketches" are an unmitigated nuisance, which every minister ought to scorn or laugh at, as a healthy man, with vigorous limbs, would at a pair of crutches. But some men go on these crutches all their days, because they are too indolent to employ their powers in walking abroad with a firm and vigorous step. What a blessing it would be to them and to the Church if all these skeletons, sketches, or crutches were burned up, and they were thrown upon their own resources, in humble dependence upon God, and in diligent effort to give to the people something new and fresh! Before the late Doctor Chalmers had experienced the saving grace of the Gospel—and he was a minister for some twelve years before this auspicious event—his preparations for the pulpit were very slight; but after his conversion the study of God's Word for his own comfort, as well as for the instruction and edification of his people, was constant, earnest, and life-long. The contrast is clearly seen in the following fact, related by his biographer. Old John Bonthron frequently and familiarly called on Mr. Chalmers. One day he said to him, "I find you aye, sir, with one thing or another; but, come when I may, I never find you at your

studies for the Sabbath." "O, an hour or two on the Saturday evening is quite enough for that!" was the minister's reply. But now the wonderful change had come which transformed him from an easy to an earnest minister, and John often found Mr. C. poring eagerly over the pages of the Bible. One day he said to him, "I never come in now, sir, but I find you aye at your Bible." "All too little, John, all too little," was the significant reply. O for such a change in every easy minister! But we must follow the easy minister now into the pulpit. It is the Bible which he opens, the word of the ever-living God; but he reads it as a school-boy would read his lesson, or as one would read an idle tale, or in so hurried a manner, and with tones so low, that no one is impressed. The hymns, too, are read without any seeming appreciation of their deep, spiritual significance. The prayer is cold, formal, heartless: and the sermon is dry, stale, and uninteresting. Is it any wonder that the people turn from such a service with loathing and disgust? Can we marvel that the secular press sometimes holds up such men to the ridicule, the scorn, and the contempt of the world? If these men were really true representatives of the pulpit in this country—which, thank God! they are not—there would be room for the unfounded assertion too often made, "that the pulpit has lost its power." So far as these easy ministers are concerned it is a failure: it is more—it is a burlesque, a caricature. It is not claimed that all men should be as seraphic as Fletcher and Whitefield, as mighty as Chalmers and Olin, or as learned as Clarke and Dwight. But it is claimed that all ministers, in their various abilities, should be as *earnest* as they were. It does not require great learning to be in great earnest. It does not require great natural or acquired powers to be an effective minister. But earnestness is the very soul of all eloquence, and never fails to command attention. And what a sad spectacle it is to see a man professedly called of God to a work in which Jesus wept, and Paul besought, and Luther thundered, and the Wesleys and Whitefield performed with quenchless zeal and ardor, and our fathers wrought with a heroism and earnestness never surpassed—aye, never equaled since apostolic days—go through its duties with the dryness of a manakin and the powerlessness of a pantomimical show!

But the easy minister is greatly fearful lest he should injure

himself. He has heard of some ministers who have studied too hard ; he would carefully avoid this by studying too little. He has read of others who have worn themselves out in the ministry. " Foolish men ! " he says to himself. " I never intend to do this." Of others, he has heard that their voice has failed in the earnest proclamations of divine truth. But he has resolved that his precious voice shall not vary much from a dull monotone. There is a saying of the Master's which it would be well for them to consider. " He that saveth—that is, shall wish to save—his life, shall lose it."—*Clarke*. It would not be wonderful—indeed, we fully believe—that if the record could be made, it would be found that the men who have studied most to " take it easy "—who have refused their strength, their life, their all to the cause of Christ—had been the earliest to fill their graves ; while the men who have toiled the hardest have, in the majority of instances, toiled the longest. We would not assert this positively, but we have strong convictions on this subject, based upon facts within the reach of all, and upon a somewhat careful and lengthened observation. Surely Paul lived to be " the aged," notwithstanding all his toils and trials ; Peter was far advanced in years before his martyrdom ; and John, the beloved disciple, was a nonagenarian. Very many of our fathers in the ministry, amid all their privations, exposures, and labors, lived on to fourscore years ; and many of the hardest workers of the present generation bid fair for a good and a green old age. All honor to these from the Church on earth, while jeweled diadems are awaiting them in the skies ! But these easy ministers will run no risks, and if they have inherited wealth or acquired it by marriage, a very slight indisposition will send them to Europe, or to a life of retracy in inglorious ease.

It could hardly be expected that such a minister would do much in the pastoral work. He will plead that he is " constitutionally unfitted for it," or that he has no time to attend to it, or that it would be " too great a tax upon his physical energies." True, there are a few families where he spends, in the aggregate, days and weeks. There are stores, offices, and other public places where he delights to resort, either joining in political debates, or mingling in neighborhood gossip, or retailing stale anecdotes and jokes to the present merriment of

the by-standers, but to the sad misgivings of thoughtful men. If he undertakes any thing like pastoral visitation, it is rather a social call than a pastoral visit. There is no religious conversation, no reading of the Scriptures, no prayer. There are not a few of our people who have not had a minister to pray in their families for years, unless at a funeral or marriage. Is it any wonder that there is so little family religion among us? That there are so many families in which the family altar has not yet been erected; or, if once erected, has fallen down?

Our people, whether in professional, mercantile, agricultural, or mechanical business, spend from eight to ten hours each day in active employment. Should not the minister spend as much time, at least, in his Master's service? And, if his time were methodically employed, all his duties could be attended to, and all the interests of the Church would be promoted. The pastoral work is a necessity in the Church. It cannot be dispensed with.

It is very possible, we know, for any one in the ministry, as in any other calling, to neglect a large part of the duties pertaining to that calling. This may be done without incurring any ecclesiastical penalty, or becoming subject to any discipline. There are a thousand ways of shirking duty and throwing off responsibility. True, such easy ministers as do these things will render themselves undesired, and it will be difficult for the appointing power of our Church to find a place for them, and in other Churches it will be difficult to obtain a "call." But all these things are *risked* by them. In our own Church, he knows that unless located—a very difficult thing to be done, by the way—he will have *some* appointment. In other Churches the case is different, and ministers are standing by the hundreds in the "ecclesiastical market-places" idle, saying, "No man hath hired us." It is a melancholy fact that, in our sister denominations, there are hundreds of Churches without Pastors, and hundreds of ministers without a charge. Why is all this? There must be a sad defect somewhere. It is doubtless true, as a rule, that in all branches of the Church an earnest, faithful, devoted minister will be sought after; while, on the other hand, no Church wants an easy minister. The demand of the Church is for *live* men; and if any others are taken, it is with reluctance, and only for the want of a better supply. What

is wanted in the great world-field is *laborers*; not men called ministers merely—not mere “functionaries for hire”—but, we repeat it, laborers. And in God’s great vineyard such men are always in demand. For such there is never any lack of employ. Other labors may be suspended or remitted; in this there can be neither remission nor suspension. It is a life-long work for the individual; it is a time-long work for the Church. And yet, notwithstanding all these facts, how many slide through from year to year, barely acceptable to the people, perfunctorily going through the dull round of their duties, grumbling because they are not more noticed and better provided for by the authorities of the Church, framing many excuses to themselves and to others why they are not more useful, and sinking down finally into an early superannuation, or into some humble secular employment.

We write not thus for the purpose of making invidious comparisons, but to call attention to facts which must press themselves upon the notice of every intelligent observer. The most earnest, faithful, and successful minister is conscious of many, many defects. And the more in earnest men are, the more deeply they feel their own weakness, and the more they tremble under the burden of their responsibility. We would that every minister in the land, amid the stirring, world-moving activities of this nineteenth century—in view of the pressing demands made upon us by a perishing world—in view of the imploring appeals of Zion as she is assailed by Rationalism, Pantheism, Romanism, and Infidelity—by wicked men, and all the swarming legions of hell, and by the intruding tide of worldliness and corruption, while the clarion-blast of her great King calls every man to his post to dare, and do, and die in his service, would renew his vows of consecration, renounce all idea of secular employment, buckle on his heaven-furnished armor afresh, and then work and toil, and live and labor “unto death” for Jesus. The world-siren and Satan may whisper in our ears, “You had better take it easy;” “You will wear yourself out.” Let our answer to all such whisperings be, “To wear out in the service of such a Master is our highest ambition, our most cherished desire.” Secular employments may tempt us by the prospect of a large increase of worldly gain. But let us remember two things: first, those hopes which the

world holds out are not always realized, or the benefits which it promises are but uncertain and temporary; and, secondly, that Christ always takes care of his faithful laborers. Suppose that Jesus were to call all his faithful laborers before him now, as of old he called his few chosen and faithful Apostles, and were to ask these laborers, as he asked them, "When I sent you forth without purse or scrip lacked ye any thing?" would they not have to answer as the Apostles did, "Nothing, Lord?" And yet another thing ought to be observed here. By engaging in worldly pursuits we might obtain, as some others do, money for ourselves and our families. We might have fine farms, fine houses, fine equipages. But what are they all? Especially, what are they all when viewed in comparison with the starry diadem, the fadeless mansion, and the everlasting joys of the heavenly world! But some may be ready to ask, "Can we not have all the former things and the latter too?" This may be barely possible: although if a man voluntarily ignores the call of God, violates his vows made at God's altar, and abandons his work merely for temporal gain, we cannot see how he can expect at last the approval of his Judge or admission into his everlasting kingdom. And yet we would judge no man. But we would say, if we must have our choice of poverty, trial, sorrow, and suffering here, with Jesus's presence with us, and angel ministrants around us, and souls gathered from sin and Satan's power; and then, when the short period of labor is over, have the crown of life and the glories of heaven vastly augmented by our labors, and toils, and privations and sorrows; or, by retiring from this work, and holding only a nominal connection with it, may have health, ease, worldly position and honor, with qualms and stings of conscience, souls perishing through our neglect, the Church ashamed and mourning over our delinquency, and then die under a cloud; and if heaven is obtained at all, wearing a starless diadem, and "saved only as by fire," let us choose with deathless ardor the former, and live, live to Christ, and labor, labor for Christ. In a word, let us be earnest, and not easy, ministers.

ART. VI.—TRAINING OF DEAF MUTES.

American Annals of Deaf and Dumb. A monthly periodical published in Washington, D. C.

Reports of the New York Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb.

Reports of the Clarke Institution for Deaf Mutes. Northampton, Mass.

Two Reports on the Institutions for the Deaf and Dumb in Central and Western Europe, and in Holland and Paris, in 1844-1859. By GEORGE E. DAX, D.D.

Report on the Methods of Instruction in the Deaf and Dumb Institutions of Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and Ireland. By EDWARD M. GALLAUDET, LL.D.

Reports of Massachusetts Board of State Charities.

As the divine and unquestionable signs of his Messiahship, our Lord said to the inquiring disciples of John Baptist, "tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the Gospel is preached." The Christianity of the present age can point to most of these evidences of the purity and divine vigor of its faith in the same Master. The spirit of Christ within the Christian Church exhibits itself in bestowing eyes upon the blind, both by skillful surgery and by the successful training of the hand largely to replace the loss of vision; in supplying cunningly contrived limbs for the lame; in mitigating the horrors and removing the causes of the most malignant diseases; in enabling the deaf mute to communicate with his fellows as if the lost sense of hearing had been returned to him; the down-trodden and abandoned, dead in trespasses and sins to hope and usefulness, have been raised to life; and to the poorest and most neglected classes, with increasing earnestness, the Gospel is preached. None of these practical forms of charity antedated the Christian era; but, following the example of her Lord who went about doing good, just in proportion to her purity, the Church has bestowed her benedictions and benefactions upon the bodies as well as souls of men. With the revival of letters in the later centuries, and the general intellectual quickening throughout Christendom, there has been a significant advance all along the line of charity; and every practicable invention of the human mind has been devoted, by the prevailing influence of the Christian spirit, to the amelioration of human suffering or the elevation of the depressed classes of society.

There are two classes unfortunately found in considerable numbers in civilized lands—because they escape the death to which they would have been consigned in infancy in barbarous countries—occasioned, perhaps, by too close intermarriages of blood-kindred, by the diseased condition of parents, by hereditary tendencies, and by subtile and, as yet, undiscovered causes. These are the blind and the deaf. No afflicted persons appeal with more mute eloquence than these to Christian hearts for aid to bring them out of their painful isolation, if possible, into the enjoyment of human society and intellectual and moral cultivation. The loss of vision is the most terrible calamity that can befall a man, considered simply as a physical being, but the congenital loss of hearing is a more fearful impediment to the development of his intellectual and spiritual nature.

No human work, at first view, seems so hopeless as the attempt to awaken and develop a mind that cannot be reached through the sense of hearing. Dr. Johnson was so impressed with the amazing difficulties that must be overcome before any appreciable success could be attained in the release of these imprisoned minds, that he represents the education of the deaf and dumb as a great philosophical curiosity. The hearing infant has no teacher to instruct him in the language of his parentage. The mother and the nurse are constantly pouring grateful sounds into his ears; almost involuntarily he imitates them. He associates words with his wants, with the objects that meet his eyes, and their appropriate ideas are clearly defined in his mind. By incessant questions and unwearied answers his vocabulary and his sphere of knowledge are enlarged. If in the society of cultivated relatives, without being aware of the severe work that has been accomplished, before he steps his foot into a school, he has learned one of the most difficult languages that the tongue attempts to utter, and without the use of a dictionary or a grammar, has become able to speak correctly, to understand quite a broad section of his native idiom, and is in a condition, without hinderance, to enter upon the whole field of human knowledge.

But how is it with the child born deaf? Ordinarily the silence or inarticulateness of the child is attributed to some impediment in the speech, and the parent eagerly but vainly waits for the string of the tongue to be loosed. The lack of

response to maternal tenderness is often attributed to idiocy or stupidity. It is not the speaking, but the hearing organ that is at fault. The harmonious waves of that involuntary teaching—the human voice—have broken without significance upon the ear, and the moving lips have conveyed no idea to the mind.

The great problem is to establish some common medium of communication by which a teacher may approach such a mind. As the ear is closed, the eye becomes the most inviting avenue for this entrance, and natural signs, such as laughing, weeping, motions of the hands, suggest the possible way of reaching the sepulchred thoughts and calling them into active exercise. By a hand alphabet words may be easily learned; but then comes the more serious problem of connecting these words with their appropriate ideas. The deaf have two different languages to learn under the most unfavorable circumstances—the language of signs as expressing ideas, and then the language of words as expressing the same ideas. As they do not hear the latter spoken, as only the nouns, or names of natural objects, can be readily represented to the eye, it can be easily seen how wearisome and difficult the work must be to lead such a chained mind along so mysterious a path, and how slowly and carefully it must be pursued to keep the idea and the sign or word permanently associated together. We can also easily see how valueless the acquiring of a knowledge of words would be, when, having simply learned the alphabet of a foreign tongue, we take up a volume and read a page of it. We may have read the words correctly, but not an idea have we received from them.

When Abbé de l'Épée, of Paris, (to whom, perhaps, deaf mutes owe more than to any other person,) whose interest and untiring zeal had been awakened in behalf of these silent sufferers by a call upon two sisters, whose lack of response to his address he could not at first comprehend, and whose great misfortune, when he discovered it, made an ineffaceable impression upon his heart, after meditating long upon the subject, grasped by a sudden inspiration the thought that all language was simply signs of ideas, that gestures were also signs of ideas, and that there might be a language of gestures as well as of arbitrary words, he at once hastened, with devout enthusiasm, to execute his plan growing out of this conception. His suc-

is
all

cess in the years following 1755 became the marvel of Europe. With his first pupils he gathered others, all of them of the poorest class, even refusing the children of wealth though pressed upon him with large pecuniary offers, esteeming the former to be greater sufferers from their loss of this important sense than the children of the rich. He soon by signs made them familiar with their written native language, and enabled them to transcribe whole pages of the most abstract disquisitions by the intermedium of gestures; but these gestures, which they had mechanically associated with certain characters, conveyed to them no notion of the real signification of those characters; for, as in every language words are but conventional signs, it is clear that, before their meaning could have been agreed upon, there must have existed some prior language mutually understood by the parties making the agreement,* such language as hieroglyphics, for instance. The great and fatal deficiency in the system of De l'Épée was soon seen. A school had been established by Abbé Storeck, according to this method, in Vienna, and, at a public exhibition, questions were asked by signs, and readily answered by the pupils in written words upon the blackboard. Mr. Nicolai, an academician of Berlin, who was present, proposed that the pupils should describe in writing the meaning of a significant act which he would perform. His request was granted. Mr. Nicolai then struck his breast with his hand, and the deaf and dumb boy simply wrote upon the board the words, *hand*, *breast*, † showing that neither the sign nor the words conveyed to him an idea, only as far as he had been taught that a certain gesture stood for a certain word, and both expressed a certain thing. Out of this very limited vocabulary he was utterly in the dark. Abbé de l'Épée's system provided a separate sign for every word used. He held that there was no more necessary or natural connection between an idea and an articulate sound striking the ear, than between the same idea, properly expressed by a natural sign, striking upon the eye; but while he found many signs almost instinctively embodying the wants and simple conceptions of deaf children, in his attempt to make a sign language entirely equivalent to ordinary speech, he overlooked, in too

* Encyclopædia Britannica.

† Encyclopædia Britannica, Art., Deaf and Dumb.

large a measure, the mental condition of his pupils in reference to the paucity of their ideas ; and while he had no difficulty in showing them that a certain easily remembered sign stood for a word which they could read in a book or write upon the board, he was sometimes only developing their habits of attention and memory, not their thoughts. This often occurs with speaking pupils, when lessons are only verbally learned, without a clear conception of their meaning ; his pupils had often no true mental picture of what is signified by both word and sign, but were mere parrots, rather than intelligent, educated scholars.

His eminent associate, successor, and intellectual superior, Abbé Sicard, saw this deficiency, and by simplifying and improving the sign language, and especially by rendering it the vernacular language of the mute, in which he should conduct his thinking, and afterward translate his sign speech into *hand-spelling* or written language, he secured a more positive and broader mental culture, and gradually led his pupils into the intellectual appreciation of the written literature of their native, and even foreign tongues, and to a rapid and satisfactory moral and religious development. Improvements have constantly been made upon this "natural method," as it is called, by the successors of these benevolent and devoted Catholic priests, down to the present Director of the great Paris Institution for Deaf Mutes, the distinguished Professor Leon Vaisse, who enjoys a high reputation as an original and successful teacher in Europe and America.

But particularly in our country has this system for the training of this unfortunate class been brought to a gratifying perfection. In 1815 several gentlemen of Hartford, influenced by their sympathy for a very interesting daughter of one of their number, an eminent physician, Miss Alice Cogswell, whose intellectual and moral development afterward, alone, was an ample compensation for their zeal and pecuniary sacrifices, sent to Europe a young clergyman whose name has since gained a world-wide reputation—Rev. T. H. Gallaudet—to qualify himself to become a teacher of deaf mutes. Meeting with an illiberal reception in England, he passed over to France, and found a warm welcome at the hand of Abbé Sicard. He enjoyed his instructions for three months, and then returned to this country, bringing with him M. Laurent Clerc, who still

survives, an educated deaf mute, and one of the favorite pupils of Sicard.

In 1817 the first Deaf and Dumb Asylum in this country, ultimately deservedly bearing (as for a long period it stood alone, and received a small national endowment) the title of the American Asylum, was opened at Hartford. A succession of very able principals and professors, many of the latter becoming the heads of institutions afterward established in different States, all of which, with two or three late exceptions, have accepted the same general system of instruction, has secured for it a careful and high elaboration, a very wide development, and made it to stand forth as a leading and representative school of training for the instruction of this large and interesting class of persons.

Particularly has this system of natural signs been brought to a remarkable degree of efficiency in the hands of the eminent and now truly venerable Dr. Peet, of the New York Institution, (for a half century an instructor of the deaf, an original investigator and writer upon the theme, to whom our country owes a large debt of respect for his unflinching devotion to his work,) and his cultivated sons, especially Professor Isaac Lewis Peet, the present principal of this large and deservedly popular institution. Under the supervision of the latter, the work of simplifying the language of signs, and bringing it under the most natural and philosophical laws—of obviating the evil intellectual tendencies of such a language called “Deaf Muteism”—of securing more clearly the development of positive ideas, and leading the mind more rapidly to the understanding of the language of the land of its nativity and its grammatical structure—is constantly going on.

The relation of the sign-language to a spoken or written language, and its peculiar idiom, will be seen in the answer of Professor Keep, of Hartford, to the following question propounded by G. G. Hubbard, Esq., of Cambridge, Mass.: “Can you give me a few signs, with their translation into English, and also a short sentence in English, with its translation into the idiom of the sign-language?” To this the Professor returns the following answer: *

I could describe to you the mode of making certain signs and explain their meaning, but I cannot write their ideas graphically, so as to exhibit them in a connected or sentence form. And in

attempting to translate an English sentence into signs, it must be always borne in mind that the English words employed to represent signs, whatever be their form, are not designed to express cases or tenses or moods. By the use of words we are able to give some idea of the order of the signs, and this is all. Mr. Turner has kindly handed me the story you sent him. I will first give a Latin version of it, and then show you what would be the order of signs, as well as I can present the same. From similarity in the arrangement and order of thoughts in the two languages, I trust you will see that one is no more a confused jargon than the other.

"A bear killed my father's geese; this made him mad. He shouldered his gun and went to look for the bear. When he discovered it he took a good position, fired, and killed the bear. The family were all very glad."

"*Ursus patris anseres mei interfecit. Id eum iratum fecit. Sclopetum humero acclinavit et ivit ut ursum quæreretur. Quum eum inveniret, loco bono occupato, telum misit et ursum occidit. Familia omnis erat lætissima.*"

In beginning the sign-version we make the sign for past time. Then, since signs require that the mode of killing should be true to nature and fact, we say "catch and eat" instead of kill. The story as rendered in signs will be: Bear, geese, father my his catch eat. Father angry very. Gun shoulder on, go look for bear. Discover. Place good stand. Fire. Bear die. Father, mother, children, all glad very.

To the question "What proportion of the exact ideas or words of a spoken sermon are actually translated into the sign language?" Professor Keep answered, "All the ideas; none of the words." And to the natural question, "How much of such a discourse is lost by the deaf mute hearers?" he responds: "Through inattention, preoccupation, or incapacity, as large a proportion may be lost by those who look upon the signs as by those who hear the voice."

Of the success of this vernacular of signs, as a means to introduce the more intelligent of this class of persons to a liberal culture in their own native literature and in other tongues, there are the most satisfactory evidences. In the high class in all the American institutions, good progress in advanced mathematics, metaphysics, the natural sciences, and the classics, gives annual assurance of this. The successful inauguration of a Collegiate Institution for the Deaf and Dumb at Washington, with a full curriculum of studies, the pupils having been "fitted" in State asylums, or in the preparatory school conducted on the same

principle, connected with the college, is another practical testimony to the same effect. The cultivated, intelligent, and very successful mute teachers employed in the different institutions for the deaf, the polished ladies, mothers of families, educated in these schools, as well as authors, editors, and artists, who have made their names to be known and honored in society by their ability, all conspire to show that the pantomimic language is a certain mediator between a soul shut out from the inspiration of the human voice and all human learning, and all possible mental and moral development. It ought in all fairness to be stated, however, that these advanced pupils are chiefly gathered from the class of semi-mutes—persons losing their hearing some years after birth.

But after all this has been accomplished, the cultivated mute is still excluded from society, and is an isolated being, only communicating with others, except the few that have learned his picturesque vernacular or the toilsome lettering of the hand, by the most wearisome process of writing; debarred from all enjoyment in the social circle, while the faces around him are glowing with pleasurable excitement, and cut off from the public lecture and the precious words that fall from the lips of the servant of God on the Sabbath day. Can this fearful chasm over the lost sense of hearing be so far bridged as to permit the soul, mutilated of one of its important members, once more to enjoy natural intercommunications with its fellows? All efforts (and they have been constantly repeated) to recall the finally deadened sense of hearing have proved failures. It is a singular fact that some of the earliest experiments in aid of the deaf mute were of the same nature as the last, and now earnestly pressed efforts in this country—to recover or to secure the power of articulation for the deaf pupil, and to enable him to read from a speaker's lips.

Three hundred years ago Pedro Ponce de Leon, a Spanish monk, born in the city of Valladolid, taught the two silent brothers and sister of the Constable of Castile, and probably others. Very few of the details of his system have been preserved, and we know not whether his most advanced pupils were born deaf, or lost their hearing after they had become somewhat familiar with spoken language. He says, however, of himself, that he taught persons who were deaf and dumb

from birth "to speak, to read, to write, to keep accounts, to repeat prayers, to serve the Mass, to know the doctrines of the Christian religion, and to confess themselves *viva voce*."

Thirty-six years after the death of Ponce, another Spaniard, John Paul Bonet, became not only a noted teacher of the deaf, but the author of the first important contribution to the literature of the subject. To him is attributed, probably without reason, as it was without much doubt of earlier invention, the construction of the manual alphabet.

In 1749, Jacob Rodrigues Pereira, a Spanish Jew, gave an exhibition of the school for deaf mutes which he had established six years before, in the presence of the Academy of Sciences at Paris. Of the results of his training the Committee say :

The pupils were able to understand whatever was said to them, whether by signs or by writing, and replied, either *viva voce* or by writing. They could read and pronounce distinctly all sorts of French expressions; they gave very sensible replies to all questions proposed to them; they understood grammar and its applications; they knew the rules of arithmetic; and performed exercises in geography; and it appeared that Pereira had given them, with speech, the faculty of acquiring abstract ideas.*

It is difficult to see how the mere power to enunciate French words could have increased their ability to conceive of the qualities of objects any better than written language or the language of signs. Pereira, selfishly seeking of the Government an exorbitant sum for his secret of teaching articulation, although he had acquired a large property as an instructor, and being refused, permitted his process of instruction to die with him.

In 1648 an English physician, John Bulwer, published the first work, in this language, upon the instruction of mutes, entitled "Philcophos, or the Deafe and Dumbe Man's Friend," which has been followed by quite a voluminous literature. In this work he claims that "a man born Deafe and Dumbe may be taught to heare the sound of words with his eie, and thence learn to speak with his tongue."

The first Scotch and English institutions, established about 1760, five years before De l'Epée, under such noted instructors

* New American Encyclopædia.

as Henry Baker and the Braidwoods, gave special attention to articulation and little to the language of signs. Thomas Braidwood advertised that, at his academy in the city of Edinburgh, he taught the dumb to speak, and also cured impediments in the speech. One of his grandchildren, John, came to this country in the early years of this century, and opened a school for deaf mutes in Virginia. His intemperate habits, however, soon broke it up. According to the testimony of impartial observers these English schools did not compare in success with that of the French under De l'Epée and Sicard.

In the same year (1755) in which De l'Epée opened his school at Paris, Samuel Heinicke, of Weissenfels, a graduate of the University at Jena, became greatly interested in the instruction of a deaf mute boy in Dresden. In 1772 he opened a school for deaf mutes, with nine pupils, in the German city of Leipsic, the first institution established in that country, and existing in a flourishing condition at the present time. He was a man of pure and noble character, of lively religious sympathies, and lived a life consecrated to God and the service of suffering humanity. From the influence of a work of John Conrad Amman, a Swiss physician, residing at Haarlem, who had undertaken the instruction of a girl deaf and dumb from birth, entitled the "Speaking Deaf Man," Heinicke held and practiced upon the opinion that there is a necessary connection between the mental idea and the spoken word; and, in entire contradistinction from the French method of De l'Epée, he sought, without the intervention of signs, to instruct his pupils in articulation, and to enable them to read the speech of others from their lips. A large portion of the German-speaking nations of Europe have followed the same system; some of them, in later years, as have many of the English schools, have, more or less, modified this system by the introduction of the sign language in connection with articulation and lip-reading.

In 1843 Horace Mann, accompanied by Dr. S. G. Howe, traveled through Europe, visiting the educational institutions, and among others, schools for the instruction of the deaf and dumb. In Mr. Mann's seventh report, as Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, he records the results of his visit, and ranks the German system of deaf and dumb training

above that of the American. This report induced the managers of the Hartford and the New York institutions to send an intelligent and expert observer, Dr. George E. Day, who had previously been connected with the latter institution, to make a thorough examination of these schools. Professor Day made two visits, in the years 1844 and 1859, carefully examining the most celebrated European institutions; but in his full and interesting reports, containing a valuable mass of very suggestive matter, he expresses, without hesitation, his preference for the American system, and his low estimate of the success attending the long and painful effort to secure the power of articulation and an ability to read from the lips of a speaker. He attributes the favorable impression made upon even cultivated minds, unfamiliar with the training of this class of persons, by the European system, to the fact that they usually witnessed only the remarkable performances of extraordinary and exceptional cases, upon whom a very long period of tuition had been expended, or who were, like many young speaking persons, children of genius. Professor Day's judgment, founded upon careful inquiry, is, that the great body of pupils in German schools are not as thoroughly educated, nor as far advanced, under their articulate training, as the same class in this country, by the use of the sign language, and that instruction in articulation and lip reading does not bestow, except upon a very small percentage of those trained in them, the power to communicate by language with others, or to hear public addresses.

In 1867 Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., son of the late distinguished first Principal of the American Institution at Hartford, himself President of the Columbia Institution and College at Washington, made an exhaustive examination of the most noted European institutions, giving particular attention to the subjects of articulation and lip reading. The result upon his mind was very similar to that upon the mind of Professor Day, except that he seems to have been somewhat more favorably impressed with the value of instruction in these branches for those mutes who had lost their hearing after having been accustomed for a time to a spoken language, and for congenital mutes manifesting a special aptitude for such tuition. With the great body of children deaf from birth, both these experienced observers esteem the period spent in teaching articula-

tion, which can never be of much practical service, as so much valuable time abstracted from the positive mental development and culture which can certainly be attained in the use of the sign language.

Dr. Gallaudet does ample justice, however, to the most favorable results attending the German system. He records, during his visit at Rotterdam, Holland, his remarkable interview with a pupil of Mr. Hirsch, director of the school in that city. He says:

Just as I was leaving Mr. Hirsch, after having held a long conversation with him, in which he urged with much earnestness, and even eloquence, the advantages of his system, a young man about twenty-five years of age entered, who was introduced to me as Mr. Edward Polano, the son of a physician, and who, with his sister, constituted the first class taught by Mr. Hirsch in Rotterdam. I was told that these persons were born totally deaf, and that they have never at any time gained the slightest power of hearing. Mr. Hirsch, in introducing Polano to me used the German language, and in telling him who I was, used the Dutch. As I shook hands with the young man I said, looking him full in the face, "Sprechen sie Deutsch?" His answer was promptly, "Ja wohl." Immediately I added, "Pariez-vous Français?" and his answer was as immediate, "Un peu." Without a moment's pause I added "Sprechen sie English?" He then hesitated a few seconds and then said distinctly "Very little," adding, with a smile, "This is a pleasant day: I am glad to see you," and saying in German that was the extent of his knowledge of English. Mr. Hirsch then retired to the other side of the room, a distance of some twenty feet, and speaking in a whisper, told young Polano in Dutch that my father was the first teacher of deaf mutes in America, that my mother was deaf and dumb, and that none of my brothers or sisters were deaf. Polano understood him perfectly and required no repetition. As I was under the necessity of parting from Mr. Hirsch at this time in order to take a train for Cologne, there was no further opportunity there for me to test Polano's powers of articulation and lip reading. But I asked him if he would not walk with me to my hotel, and he replied, "Mit vergnügen." I will give in English the greater part of what passed between us after starting on our walk, premising the remark that *all* our conversation was in *oral German*, without the use of a single sign. As we left the house of Mr. Hirsch, Polano said: "What hotel are you staying at?" I replied: "The hotel des Pays Bas." "O, I know it," said he. "Do you know my name?" he asked. "Yes," said I, "it is Polano." "That is right," said he, and we exchanged cards. "Do you not believe I was born deaf?" he inquired. "O yes," said I, and added immediately, "Do you talk with your sister by signs or with the

voice?" "With the voice," replied he; "I prefer it." "Isn't it very warm to-day?" said he. "Very warm," was my answer. Presently I remarked: "I think we are not going right, for my hotel." "O yes," said he, "we are right; did not you say you were stopping at the hotel des Pays Bas?" "Yes," I answered, "that is the name of my hotel." "Then we are quite right," said he, adding, "I live in Rotterdam, you remember, and know the city well." We walked on further, when, being quite sure we were going astray, I repeated that I feared we were wrong, adding that we were following quite a different course from that I took in going from my hotel, and asking if there were two hotels of the name Pays Bas in Rotterdam. He said he thought not; and so we kept on. Growing quite certain we were wrong, I stopped, and insisted we were not right, and said I feared I should be too late for the Cologne train if we did not reach my hotel soon. He seemed much troubled, and asked me if I would prefer to take a carriage. I said I would; and so we hailed a cab driver, and Polano asked him if there were two hotels des Pays Bas in Rotterdam. The cabman replied that there were, and mentioned that one was Adler's. I then remembered that was the name of the proprietor of my hotel, and so we jumped into the cab and told the driver to go to Adler's hotel des Pays Bas. Polano said as we rattled over the stones, in a voice that I perfectly understood, "I hope my mistake will not make you too late for your train; I did not know there were two hotels of the same name here." On reaching my hotel I paid my bill and got my luggage very hurriedly, and then we hastened on in the carriage to the railway station. On the way I took out my watch, and Polano said, "Is that an American watch?" On my replying in the affirmative he seemed much interested, and wanted to look at it. Just before we reached the railroad station I asked him how much I ought to pay the driver, and he said he thought one florin was quite enough. He asked me when I should come to Rotterdam again, and I said I hoped in a few years. I asked him when I should see him in America. This question I had to repeat a second time, when he replied, with a shrug, that it cost too much money; that perhaps by and by, when he was rich, he would go. I told him he must come to see me in Washington if he came to America. He replied he certainly would. As we reached the railroad station he said he hoped I would excuse him for making me so much trouble about getting to my hotel. As I handed a porter some money for taking my luggage he remarked, "You paid him too much." He accompanied me to the railroad carriage, and ~~bid~~ me good-bye, and in a moment the train moved. All this I have described was done in the greatest hurry. From the time I left Mr. Hirsch, Polano and I were either walking at a rapid pace through crowded streets, or riding over the pavements in a carriage, and yet what conversation we had was carried on with perfect ease, and without any resort whatever to the language of signs. The circumstances of

my interview with Polano were of such a nature as to induce me to accord cheerfully the merit of notable and praiseworthy success to Mr. Hirsch in this case ; asking you, however, to bear in mind that the young man and his sister were private pupils of Mr. Hirsch during a period of eleven years, and were, therefore, in the enjoyment of advantages secured at a cost far beyond what can reasonably be demanded at the hands of public legislators or almoners of private benevolence in behalf of the great mass of deaf mutes, coming as they do from families of the poor.

The Massachusetts Board of State Charities, of which Dr. Howe is a member, in its very able reports for the last two or three years, and its late accomplished Secretary, F. B. Sanborn, have taken exceptions to the system of instruction pursued in the Hartford Institution, where, heretofore, the State had sent her mute children for education, and have strenuously advocated the training of her children at home upon the German system of articulation. Two interesting incidents brought to an unexpectedly early consummation their plans in this regard. The young daughter of a prominent and wealthy lawyer of Boston lost, through a severe attack of disease, her hearing. The afflicted and affectionate parents at once devoted themselves to the care of this beloved child, and sought to soften, as far as possible, the heavy blow that had fallen upon her. By unceasing care they enabled her to preserve her power of speech, and also to read their words from their lips, thus keeping her still in social fellowship with her friends, although unbroken silence reigned around her. Her eyes have been made to do double duty, and she hears with them as well as sees. Both sympathy and benevolence made this influential gentleman a warm advocate for the establishment of a State school, and for the use of articulation and lip-reading, as the chief means of training. He has since become an active Trustee in the first State Institution of Massachusetts.

Just at this time, Miss Harriet B. Rogers, a sister of the successful teacher of Laura Bridgeman and Oliver Caswell, blind mutes at the Institution for the Blind in Boston, had a deaf mute placed under her charge, to whom she taught articulation. Her success encouraged her to establish a school in 1866 in Chelmsford, Mass., where she soon collected seven scholars.

The marked success of her experiment, and the gift of fifty

thousand dollars from Mr. John Clarke, of Northampton, (since increased to two hundred thousand dollars on the death of the lamented donor,) induced the Legislature to establish the Clarke Institution for Deaf Mutes at Northampton, Mass. This has been placed in charge of Miss Rogers, with a corps of female assistants. Three annual reports have now been made. Of the nature and success of the school, the Trustees say, in their second report :

At the Clarke Institution, instruction in articulation and lip-reading is not pursued to the exclusion or the neglect of general education. One of the great merits of our system is, that general education is not only not neglected, but is greatly promoted by the course of instruction pursued. Even if it were true, that during the first two or three years the progress of the child is not so rapid as when taught by signs, (an admission we are by no means prepared to make,) yet instruction is commenced at a much earlier period. The time which would otherwise have been spent in idleness and ignorance is employed in overcoming the difficulties which attend the early stages of instruction, and before the age is reached when signs are usually first taught, the child is fairly started on a path of progress at once rapid and assured. There is no confusion of idioms to be overcome. The text-books are not in a foreign tongue, which must be translated into signs. After a course of equal length with that devoted to the hearing child, ten, twelve, or fifteen years, the progress of the deaf youth will compare not unfavorably with that of many of his more fortunate fellows.

Of the plan and progress of the institution under the care of Miss Rogers, as they strike a trained observer, a master of the French system, Dr. Peet remarks, in a report of a visit to her institution after it had been in operation about a year :

Miss Rogers does not profess to make articulation a chief end of instruction, (except in rare cases,) giving to exercises in that specialty only two hours daily. She admits that, as a general rule, they cannot be restored to society by means of articulation ; that is, cannot share in a general conversation, or hold oral conversation with strangers, much less understand a sermon or public lecture. But she holds that they will be able to communicate by articulation and lip-reading with their immediate friends, who do not understand signs or the manual alphabet. That most of them may be able to do this may be conceded. . . . Miss Rogers holds that lip-reading is the best instrument of instruction for the deaf and dumb. She ardently desires and hopes to make words for them what they are to the semi-mutes as well as to those who hear, the direct representations of ideas and the medium of thought and reasoning.

Her success in this, Dr. Peet thinks, yet remains to be proved, with all the testimony in regard to European institutions against her. But it may be that American enthusiasm and perseverance in the instance of a peculiarly earnest woman will accomplish larger results than have been realized elsewhere. Of her wonderful success in one instance Dr. Peet bears honorable testimony:

I have spoken of the general unintelligibility of the utterances of these pupils at Northampton. I have to record three remarkable exceptions, Roscoe Green and Jerome H. Plummer, semi-mutes, and Etta Theresa B. Dudley, deaf from birth. The two former cases can be matched by some of our own pupils who speak intelligibly, and have accustomed themselves at home to read on the lips of their intimate friends. Miss Dudley is a rare and peculiar instance of success in teaching articulation and labial reading to the congenitally deaf. She had been taught through signs and the manual alphabet for a considerable time at home by Miss Edwards, a graduate of the American Asylum; by Miss Blauvelt, a graduate of the New York institution; had been two years at the Institution in Hartford, and had been under instruction by articulation at the Clarke Institution a little over a year. Her articulation was labored and slow, but intelligible. I saw and heard her converse with her mother at a distance of ten or twelve feet, and in a manner to be understood. When it is considered that she was thirteen years old when she came to school, having previously been taught to articulate a few words only, her case certainly presents one of the most remarkable examples of success in teaching articulation I ever heard or read of. From some rare peculiarity of temperament and mental organization she seems to prefer speech to signs. While her case shows what can be done in comparatively rare instances, it can by no means be taken as an indication of the average degree of success in this branch of instruction.

The Trustees of this school only encourage the entrance of pupils who did not lose their hearing until they had reached or advanced beyond the third year; or those born deaf, who have a peculiar aptitude for learning to speak; or, finally, those who can hear a little, but not clearly enough to attend a common school with profit. They suppose that about one half the whole number of deaf mutes would be embraced in these classes. The average of those in European schools who seem to be profited by this form of training is very much smaller than this.

The discussion of the comparative value of these two leading

systems, the French (for the American is based upon this) and the German, and the success of Miss Rogers in her new enterprise, have awakened much interest throughout the country. A small and quite successful school for articulation was established two or three years since in the city of New York by certain German gentlemen, employing Professor B. Engelman, who was educated in a German institution, now very successfully developing his specialty, and teaching articulation in the New York State Institution, who has been succeeded in his private school by Mr. Resing, formerly a professor in the New York Institution. A school of the same character is to be established in the city of Boston, under the direction of its General School Committee. Nearly all the great State institutions in the country are now giving renewed attention to this matter, and in many instances have appointed well qualified instructors to devote their entire energies to this branch of training.

At a late Conference of the Principals of the American Institutions, held in Washington, after a thorough discussion of the question the following resolutions, as expressing their matured judgment, were passed with great unanimity :

Resolved, That the American system of deaf mute education, as practiced and developed in the institutions of this country for the last fifty years, commends itself by the best of all tests—that of prolonged, careful, and successful experiment—as in a pre-eminent degree adapted to relieve the peculiar misfortune of deaf mutes as a class, and restore them to the blessings of society.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Conference, it is the duty of all Institutions for the education of the Deaf and Dumb to provide adequate means for imparting instruction in articulation and lip-reading to such of their pupils as may be able to engage with profit in exercises of this nature.

Resolved, That, while in our judgment it is desirable to give semi-mutes and semi-deaf children every facility for retaining and improving any power of articulate speech they may possess, it is not profitable, except in promising cases, discovered after fair experiment, to carry congenital mutes through a course of instruction in articulation.

Resolved, That to attain success in this department of instruction an added force of instructors will be necessary, and this Conference hereby recommends to Boards of Directors of Institutions for the Deaf and Dumb in this country that speedy measures be taken to provide the funds needed for the prosecution of this work.

ART. VII.—THE METHODIST HYMN BOOK AND ITS ASSOCIATIONS.

A NEW work has just issued from the English press, entitled "The Methodist Hymn Book and its Associations. By GEORGE J. STEVENSON. With Notes, by the late Rev. W. M. Bunting, and an Introductory Poem by Benjamin Gough. London: 1870. Pp. 429." It has a London publisher, but is also advertised in the imprint to be "sold at 66 Paternoster Row," which is an indication that the British Conference either owns the work or has an interest in it, probably obtained since the author put his book to press. The "Notes" mentioned on the title-page are few, and not at all important, being only the transient memoranda of Mr. Bunting on the margin of his Hymn Book. The name of Mr. Bunting was evidently used merely to help the sale of the work. The preface is brief, occupying but two pages, and refers to the great blessing which Charles Wesley's hymns have been to the Church, and the frequency with which they have been triumphantly repeated by dying Christians. More than five hundred instances of this kind are given in the volume. The most of these are extracts from the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, and the rest from Methodist biographies. There are a few anecdotes from other sources. This may be considered the characteristic feature of the work, which the author hopes "may be deemed in some respects a not unworthy companion to those compositions."

The plan of the work is almost an exact imitation of Mr. Creamer's "Methodist Hymnology." The hymns in the Wesleyan Methodist Hymn Book—the first line of each—are given in consecutive order; then follows the original title; the name of the tune applied to the hymn in Mr. Wesley's "Sacred Harmony;" the author's name; the Scripture text, when there is one, on which the hymn is founded; the title of the work, and the year in which the hymn was first published; omissions and alterations of stanzas. Sometimes a short criticism or biographical sketch is given, and occasional illustrative passages from the English poets. Lastly, as stated above, follow examples of the use made of the hymns by departing saints.

The work is emphatically a compilation; there is little evi-

dence of, although there are some attempts at, originality, but considerable indications of industry in gathering up whatever has been written by others about the different hymns. In this regard, perhaps, no one work, except the *Wesleyan Magazine*, has been in more constant requisition than the "*Methodist Hymnology*;" indeed, Mr. Stevenson has publicly proclaimed himself a follower and student of Mr. Creamer in this department; and yet, strange to say, out of more than fifty instances of palpable quotation, in one case only, on page 184, does he deign to acknowledge his indebtedness.

It is a natural supposition, that nothing gives an author more satisfaction than to know that his writings are read and approved; but to withhold from him the credit due to the productions of his mental industry, and especially to see them adopted by another as his own, not only extracts the sense of pleasure, but leaves in its place a consciousness of the injustice that has been practiced upon him, and the wrong-doing of the offender. Some evidence of such conduct, we think, will appear in the following quotations from Mr. Stevenson's book.

Hymn 28: * "O Love divine! what hast thou done?"

It is a sweet and touching composition. Rev. Dr. Thomas O. Summers, of America, supposes that the refrain of this hymn, "My Lord, my Love, is crucified," is taken from Ignatius, martyr in the Primitive Church. The same line is found in J. Mason's "Songs of Praise," which appeared in 1683.—*Stevenson*, p. 24, from *Creamer*, p. 284.

Hymn 48: "Ah, lovely appearance of death!"

Caroline Bowles, who became the wife of Robert Southey, poet laureate, has written this passage:

"And is this death? Dread thing!
If such thy visiting,
How beautiful thou art!"—*Stevenson*, p. 44.

Mrs. Hemans also has a similar passage:

"And is this death? Dread thing!" etc.—*Creamer*, p. 423.

Here Mr. Stevenson corrects Mr. Creamer as to the authorship of the lines from Miss Bowles, but omits the courtesy of mentioning the fact, while he adopts the passage.

Hymn 53: "Give glory to Jesus, our Head."

The poet has expressed an idea in the second verse which is worthy of remark; it is:

° The numbering is that of the *English Hymn Book*.

"Where glorified spirits, by sight,
Converse in their holy abode."

That intercourse should be carried on by sight, in the heavenly state, is certainly novel; and yet the same thought is stated in a passage by Butler in his *Hudibras*, which runs thus:

"Or, who, but lovers, can converse,
Like angels, by the eye discourse?
Address and compliment by vision."

Stevenson, p. 48; from Creamer, p. 441.

Hymn 103: "O that I could revere."

This striking figure of speech ["Show me the naked sword, Impending o'er my head,"] is taken from the story of Damocles, as related by Cicero of Dionysius, King of Italy, and one of his flatterers, B. C. 368, etc. The Rev. Joseph Stennett employs the same figure thus:

"Who laughs at sin, laughs at his Maker's frowns,
Laughs at the sword of vengeance o'er his head."

Stevenson, p. 79; from Creamer, p. 246.

In this instance the use made of the story of Damocles was not original with either Mr. Creamer or Mr. Stevenson, but is a quotation from a work on "*Wesleyan Hymnology*" by the late W. P. Burgess, to whom Mr. Creamer gives due credit. The illustrative passage from Stennett was used originally by Mr. Creamer.

Hymn 117: "God is in this and every place."

There is a singular coincidence deserving of notice in this as well as in another of Charles Wesley's hymns. The first two verses read thus:

"And have I measured half my days,
And half my journey run,
Nor tasted the Redeemer's grace,
Nor yet my work begun?"

"The morning of my life is past,
The noon is almost o'er;
The night of death approaches fast,
When I can work no more."

When these lines were written their author was in his fortieth year; he died aged eighty. How did he obtain the knowledge that he had measured half his days?—*Stevenson, p. 86; from Creamer, p. 244.*

Hymn 128: "With glorious clouds encompass'd round."

The sentiment conveyed in the first verse is also contained in the first verse of Hymn 130. The line, "Whom angels dimly see," seems to have been suggested by a similar expression of Milton's:

"Who sittest above these heavens,
To us invisible, or dimly seen!"

Samuel Wesley, Jun., in Hymn 561, has the following couplet:

"In light unsearchable enthroned,
Whom angels dimly see!"—*Stevenson, p. 89.*

A hymn in the poet's most impassioned strain; although the thought in the first, and repeated in the last stanza, and perhaps the expression, belong to Milton.

Hymn 132: "Jesus, the sinner's Friend, to thee."

The strong language used in the third verse,

"Tread down thy foes, with power control
The beast and devil in my soul,"

the Wesleys and Whitefield learned from Bishop Hall and William Law. Southey, in his "Life of Wesley," relates the story of a merry-andrew who attended the preaching of Whitefield, and made a most indecent exposure of his person. Whitefield himself was for a moment confounded with such a spectacle, but recovering himself, he appealed to his audience whether he had wronged human nature in saying, with Bishop Hall, that man when left to himself is half a fiend and half a brute; or in calling him, with William Law, a motley mixture of the beast and devil.—*Stevenson*, p. 91; *from Creamer*, p. 249.

Hymn 155: "God of my life, what just return."

These stanzas, (referring to several omitted from the Hymn Book, but inserted in Mr. Creamer's work,) in sublimity of thought, and strength of expression, surpass Addison's fine hymn written under similar circumstances, which commences, "When rising from the bed of death," etc.—*Stevenson*, p. 102; *from Creamer*, p. 252.

Hymn 163: "When, gracious Lord, when shall it be."

The idea contained in the second verse, "O dark! dark! dark! I still must say," is similar to a line in Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, line eighty, as follows: "O dark! dark! dark! amid the blaze of noon."—*Stevenson*, p. 106.

The second stanza,

"A poor blind child I wander here,
If haply I may feel Thee near:
O dark! dark! dark! I still must say,
Amidst the blaze of Gospel day!"

is an imitation of Milton in *Samson Agonistes*, where he puts the following language in the mouth of Samson:

"But chief of all,
O loss of sight, of thee I most complain!
Blind among enemies. . . .
O dark! dark! dark! amid the blaze of noon,
Irrecoverably dark, total eclipse,
Without all hope of day."—*Creamer*, p. 267.

Hymn 224: "I'll praise my Maker while I've breath."

The first line John Wesley has altered from "I'll praise my Maker *with my breath*;" and verse three in the original reads thus:

"The Lord hath eyes to give the blind,
The Lord supports the sinking mind."

The thought of the poet in the third verse seems to be borrowed from "Pope's Messiah:"

"All ye blind, behold!
He from thick films shall purge the visual ray,
And on the sightless eyeball pour the day."

—*Stevenson*, p. 146; from *Creamer*, p. 319.

Hymn 229: "God of my life, to thee."

The singular idea in the last two lines,

"Like Moses to thyself convey,
And kiss my raptured soul away!"

is founded on a tradition among the Jews, that the Almighty drew the soul or spirit of Moses out of his body by a kiss. Dr. Watts, in his *Lyric Poems on the death of Moses*, gives the same idea thus:

"Softly his fainting head he lay
Upon his Maker's breast!
His Maker kissed his soul away,
And laid his flesh to rest."

—*Stevenson*, p. 150; from *Creamer*, p. 408.

Hymn 231: "Away with our fears! The glad morning appears."

Few persons besides the Brothers Wesley could say of friends what Charles Wesley says in one of the omitted verses:

"How rich in friends, Thy providence sends,
To help my infirmity on!
What a number I see, Who could suffer for me,
And ransom my life with their own."

—*Stevenson*, p. 151; from *Creamer*, p. 408.

Hymn 262: "A thousand oracles divine."

Dr. Edward Young, in his "Night Thoughts," has the following, which exactly corresponds with the seventh verse of this fine hymn:

"They see on earth a bounty not indulged on high,
And downward look for heaven's superior praise!"

—*Stevenson*, p. 159; from *Creamer*, p. 301.

Hymn 276: "Worship, and thanks, and blessing."

Men who could thus suffer and thus sing were as ready for the "lions' den," or the "fiery furnace," as for the infuriated madness of men and beasts.—*Stevenson*, p. 166.

Men who could suffer and thus sing would, under similar circumstances, be as ready as Daniel to be cast into "the lions' den," or to enter, like the three Hebrew children, the "fiery furnace," even though it were heated seven times hotter than usual.—*Creamer*, p. 439.

Hymn 323: "God of almighty love."

In the third verse of the original the first line is, "Spirit of grace, inspire," and the last line is, "A worm into a god." The alterations are to be preferred; but the idea conveyed in the last line exactly corresponds with a passage in the first book of Young's "Night Thoughts:—"

"How poor, how rich, how abject, how august,
How complicate, how wonderful is man! * * *

Midway from nothing to the Deity!
A beam ethereal, sullied and absorpt!
Though sullied and dishonored, still divine!
Dim miniature of greatness absolute!
An heir of glory, a frail heir of dust!
Helpless immortal, insect infinite!
A worm! a god!"

Young, as a poet, was a favorite with the Wesleys; but probably both Young and the Wesleys had in their minds the recollection of the words of the Saviour: "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods."—*Stevenson*, p. 179; *from Creamer*, p. 275.

Hymn 340: "The thing my God doth hate."

There is a remarkable thought in the third verse, "Soul of my soul." "Christ and the true believer become, as it were, identified; for he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." Sir Richard Blackmore has the same thought in his "Ode to the Divine Being:—"

"Blessed object of my love intense,
I thee my joy, my treasure call,
My portion, my reward immense,
Soul of my soul, my life, my all."

—*Stevenson*, p. 196; *from Creamer*, p. 333.

Hymn 344: "Thou hidden love of God, whose height."

John Wesley, in his "Plain Account of Christian Perfection," records that he wrote (translated) this hymn while at Savannah, Georgia, in the year 1736; and he quotes the line in verse four commencing, "Is there a thing beneath the sun," to show his religious sentiments at that period. Dr. Southey, confusing dates, gives the affection for Grace Murray as the origin of this hymn. Mr. B. Love, in his "Records of Wesleyan Life," describes this hymn as the pious contemplation of a soul seeking for full redemption. In a translated "Life of Tersteegen," by the Rev. Samuel Jackson, a version of this hymn is given with two stanzas, the fourth and fifth, more than John Wesley had translated.—*Stevenson*, p. 199; *from Creamer*, p. 334.

In the above extract Mr. Stevenson misinterprets Mr. Creamer's words, and accuses Dr. Southey of "confusing dates," and thereby falling into an error concerning Mr. John Wesley's love affair, while in Georgia, with Miss Sophia Hop

kins.* There is no mistake. Dr. Southey is correct; he does not refer to Grace Murray, as asserted by Mr. Stevenson. Does not Mr. Stevenson know that Mr. Wesley's "affection for Grace Murray" was his second essay in unsuccessful courtship? And his "affection," not for "Grace Murray," but for Miss Sophy, as Mr. Wesley frequently calls her, was doubtless, as Dr. Southey believed, the "thing striving to share his heart," alluded to in the stanza of the hymn, which runs thus:

"Is there a thing beneath the sun
That strives with thee my heart to share?
Ah! tear it thence, and reign alone,
The Lord of every motion there!"

The time and circumstances when the hymn was written all conspire to justify the supposition of Dr. Southey. To give up Miss Sophy was the greatest trial of his life up to that time.

Hymn 390: "Since the Son hath made me free."

Here a great blunder has been committed by Mr. Stevenson by inserting under this hymn the remarks intended to accompany the next three hymns, namely, Nos. 391, 392, 393.

The whole of this hymn (comprising the above three hymns) may be found at the end of Mr. Wesley's fortieth sermon, the subject of which is "Christian Perfection." It was a great favorite with both John Wesley and John Fletcher, who made good use of it in their controversies with the opponents of the doctrine of sanctification. Mr. Fletcher, in his "Last Check to Antinomianism," says of his opponent's antagonism to the doctrine, "It doubtless chiefly springs from his inattention to our definition of it, which I once more sum up in these comprehensive lines of Mr. Wesley." Then follow the lines of this hymn.—*Stevenson*, p. 221; *from Creamer*, p. 347.

Mr. Stevenson is singularly unfortunate when he attempts to alter or correct another's text, as already shown in regard to Dr. Southey. This is another instance. Mr. Fletcher, in the above extract from his "Last Check," does not refer to the whole "hymn" of Wesley, but only to the following verse, the "lines" of which he quotes:

"O let me gain perfection's height!
O let me into nothing fall!
And less than nothing in thy sight,
And feel that Christ is all in all!"

* Not Causton—this was her uncle's name, with whom she lived; hence the error of Mr. Wesley's biographers as to her true name.

Hymn 428: "Let Him to whom we now belong."

The self-consecration expressed in this and the previous hymn is, as Dr. Brevint remarks, inclusive of all which we are, and which we can give to God, even to the least vessel in our houses; all are made holy in this one consecration.—*Stevenson*, p. 234; *from Creamer*, p. 338.

Hymn 433: "Give me the faith which can remove."

In the second verse the poet breathes "a strong desire" for "a calmly fervent zeal,

'To save poor souls out of the fire,
To snatch them from the verge of hell;
And turn them to a pard'ning God,
And quench the brands in Jesus' blood.'

Pollok, in his "Course of Time," has a passage which has a strong resemblance to these lines, (B. II, l. 157:)

"The Holy One for sinners dies;
The Lord of life for guilty rebels bleeds;
Quenches eternal fire with blood divine."

—*Stevenson*, p. 236; *from Creamer*, p. 391.

Hymn 468: "God only wise, almighty, good."

This fine and practical hymn inculcates some really invaluable lessons for the proper government of a family. The "sacred clew" of the fourth verse, which guides persons in a labyrinth, and keeps them in the right way, is especially striking and suggestive.—*Stevenson*, p. 246; *from Creamer*, p. 405.

Hymn 524: "Our friendship sanctify and guide."

This hymn was specially written by the poet for himself and his brother, which will at once account for the personal character of the phraseology.—*Stevenson*, p. 265; *from Creamer*, p. 383.

Hymn 552: "Jesus drinks the bitter cup."

The long and interesting note on this hymn is from a valuable work on "Wesleyan Hymnology," by the late W. P. Burgess, who gives an account from Plutarch concerning a singular circumstance that transpired during the reign of Tiberius, Emperor of Rome, in the Ionian Sea at the time of our Saviour's crucifixion, when a voice was heard exclaiming, "The great Pan is dead." This fine classical allusion is quoted at great length in "Methodist Hymnology," whence, if not directly from Mr. Burgess, it was copied by Mr. Stevenson.

Hymn 564: "Infinite God, to thee we raise."

This paraphrase has been very generally ascribed to the poet Dryden, but erroneously. He has published a version of this fine

hymn, but it is much inferior to this one by Charles Wesley. His is in the decasyllabic verse, and commences thus:

"Thee, sovereign God, our grateful accents praise;
We own thee, Lord, and bless thy wond'rous ways."

—*Stevenson*, p. 287; *from Creamer*, p. 462.

Hymn 579: "Great is the Lord our God."

In one of the omitted stanzas, Dr. Watts has shown most convincingly how the power of the Almighty is the defense of any nation that trusts in him:

"When navies, tall and proud,
Attempt to spoil our peace,
He sends his tempests roaring loud,
And sinks them in the seas."

[Not "roaming round," as Mr. Stevenson has it in the third line.]

Similar in sentiment is that line of Charles Wesley's in which he prays for the defeat of the French navy. When that nation was seeking to invade England, Charles Wesley's prayer for the intruding invaders was very pointed:

"Sink them in the Channel, Lord!"

—*Stevenson*, p. 291; *from Creamer*, p. 446.

Hymn 583: "Again our weekly labors end."

This is part of a hymn of fourteen stanzas, originally written by Joseph Stennett, and published in 1732. It has been so altered by some one, that, as it appears in the Methodist collection, only the last five lines are copied in their integrity. The first verse reads thus:

"Another six days' work is done;
Another Sabbath is begun:
Return, my soul, unto thy rest;
Revere the day thy God has blest."

—*Stevenson*, p. 295; *from Creamer*, p. 410.

Hymn 630: "Hail the day that sees Him rise."

The poet had a great liking to the word "pomp," if we may judge from the frequency of its occurrence in his hymns. He takes care, however, not to use it in a loose, indiscriminate manner, but seems ever to have his eye upon the original import. It was a religious word among the Greeks, and was used by them to denote a religious procession. Accordingly, the poet, in verse 2 of this hymn, says, "There the pompous triumph waits;" and in other places, "And lead the pompous triumph on," "By the pomp of thine ascending."—*Stevenson*, p. 317; *from Creamer*, p. 435.

Hymn 689: "Jesu, my God and King."

The original has eleven verses. In the ninth verse the poet describes the expulsion of Lucifer from heaven in these emphatic words:

"Lucifer as lightning fell,
Far from heaven, from glory far,
Headlong hurl'd to deepest hell!"—*Stevenson*, p. 343.

Verse 9 contains a fine description of the expulsion of the rebel angel from heaven. The expression in the last line,

"Headlong hurl'd to deepest hell,"

is particularly striking, sense and sound being as admirably combined as in any passage of our best English poets; while the alliteration in three out of five words gives the line a finish that is exquisite, and almost inimitable:

"Thee, when the Dragon's pride,
To battle vain defied,
Brighter than the Morning Star,
Lucifer, as lightning, fell
Far from heaven, from glory far,
Headlong hurl'd to deepest hell!"—*Creamer*, p. 447.

Hymn 713: "Wisdom ascribe, and might, and praise."

There are few more beautifully sublime passages in Charles Wesley's hymns than the fourth stanza of this one, which is omitted. The idea of the poet is that of a sinner weighed in the "balance" of the Gospel and found wanting: the beam begins to preponderate, a soul is about to topple into hell; but, hark! the "remnant" (Rom. ix, 27) are praying, the Holy Ghost is groaning, the Son interceding, the Father becomes propitious, and the swift-winged angel of mercy executes his commission by touching the quivering scale, and, lo! that soul is saved.

"Still in the doubtful balance weigh'd,
We trembled, while the remnant pray'd;
The Father heard his Spirit groan,
And answer'd mild, It is my Son!
He let the prayer of faith prevail,
And mercy turn'd the hov'ring scale."

—*Stevenson*, p. 350; *from Creamer*, p. 455.

In reference to the above verse, and the previous description, Mr. Stevenson says, "Those who remember the late William Dawson will recognize in them the outline of one of that eminent man's most powerful and impressive discourses, 'The Windlass.'" If Mr. Stevenson be correct, the coincidence of Mr. Creamer, who has never visited England, reproducing the skeleton of one of Mr. Dawson's most celebrated discourses seven years after his death, and at the distance of three thousand miles, is indeed remarkable; but it ought not to prevent

the American author from receiving at the hands of his English brother hymnologist the usual courtesy of an honest recognition. Can Mr. Stevenson furnish the evidence of the correctness of his assertion? Without meaning to impeach his veracity, we may say, that in a somewhat careful stroll through Mr. Everett's very able and full biography of Mr. Dawson we have failed to find any reference to the incident in question. Mr. Everett quotes many lines and stanzas of his hero's favorite hymns, and mentions the titles of some of his most popular missionary and other discourses, as "The Telescope," "The Railroad," "The Musical Clock," "The Reform Bill," "The British Lion," and others; but there is no mention of "The Windlass," nor of the stanza. As Mr. Stevenson professes to give the facts concerning this matter from recollection, we would remind him that Mr. Dawson died more than twenty-eight years ago, and his *Memoirs* appeared the following year, when all the circumstances connected with his "most powerful and impressive discourses" were fresh in the mind of his faithful biographer. It seems to us that, taking the above stanza and accompanying remarks as expressive of the character of the sermon, the more appropriate title would be, "The Scales," or "The Balance," both of these words being used in the lines quoted from Wesley. But there is nothing in them, nor the foregoing description, that to our mind is at all suggestive of a "Windlass." Is it not just possible that in this instance, as in that of Dr. Southey and Grace Murray, Mr. Stevenson's judgment is at fault?

Hymn 718: "I call the world's Redeemer mine."

By adopting the erroneous translation of the passage put forth in what is called the authorized version of the Scriptures, Mr. Wesley has fallen into the generally received error, "Though after my skin worms destroy this body," etc. (Job xix, 26.) The poet says,

"And though the worms this skin devour;"

and again in the fourth verse,

"Then let the worms demand their prey."

Dr. Watts has the same idea in Hymn 721; and Hart, in one of his hymns, embodies the same opinion. In Hymn 726 the same idea is found; but the opinion is not found in the original Scriptures, nor is it a recognized physical fact that worms destroy the bodies of the dead."—*Stevenson*, p. 355; *from Creamer*, p. 456.

Hymn 759: "O Thou that hangedst on the tree."

Yet of these even (the conversion of condemned malefactors) he (Charles Wesley) has left evidence of the rescue of many; and in this hymn the great cardinal doctrine of our holy religion, FAITH, is clearly stated and strongly enforced.—*Stevenson*, p. 385; *from Creamer*, p. 461.

Hymn 213: "My God, the spring of all my joys."

This hymn, says Milner in his "Life of Watts," "is almost without spot or blemish, if we except the last line of verse 4, which was amended by John Wesley." "T'embrace my dearest Lord," wrote Watts. Wesley made other improvements in the hymn. An able critic in the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine says of this hymn that "it is the very best Watts wrote, and breathes the intense earnestness, and passionate, kindling fervor of Wesley himself. It is an effusion of irrepressible joy and triumphant faith."—*Stevenson*, p. 137; *from Creamer*, p. 317.

Hymn 334: "Lord, I adore thy gracious will."

Dr. Adam Clark gives frequent commendation of the poetry of Charles Wesley in his Notes on the Bible; and on this short hymn the discriminating critic makes these observations in his notes on this passage of Holy Writ: "No soul of man can suppose that ever God bade one man to curse another, much less that he commanded such a wretch as Shimei to curse such a man as David," etc.—*Stevenson*, p. 189; *from Creamer*, p. 197.

Hymn 507: "Saviour of all, to thee we bow."

A writer in the "Southern Methodist Quarterly," vol. ii, (American,) remarking on this hymn, says, "As faith is a receiving and appropriating, not a bestowing or imparting grace, there have been objections to the line, 'The heavenly manna faith imparts.'"—*Stevenson*, p. 262; *from Creamer*, p. 380.

The above extracts are composed partly of original thoughts, and partly, as will be observed, of quotations from other authors; but the precise language of neither is on all occasions adopted. Sometimes there are slight variations of expression, and occasionally additions or omissions of parts of sentences; but in every instance the substance of the passages quoted is given, so that they can at once be identified, and ought to have been acknowledged.

There are many other similar, though not so palpable, cases as most of the above of what must be considered outright plagiarism. An examination of the remarks which accompany the following hymns, 25, 43, 49, 330, 437, 503, 529, 592, 728, in the

work of Mr. Stevenson, and the same hymns in that of Mr. Creamer numbered 195, 551, 558, 404, 510, 415, 453, 377, 539, will show a most extraordinary identity of thought and research in the prosecution and recorded results of their respective studies. The fact, however, that Mr. Creamer's work has been before the public for more than twenty years seems to give it a claim to originality and credit in such cases, except where they are clearly instances of accidental concurrence, or of independent investigation.

There are numerous other instances of want of candor, and evidences of carelessness and inefficiency in the work. It is stated on page 41, that Samuel Wesley, Jun.'s, hymn, "The morning flowers display their sweets," was first published by John Wesley in 1743, instead of by the author in 1736. On page 47, "Samuel *Hutchings*" for Hitchings; on page 48, "*Oh, who,*" for Or, who; on page 116, "*Miss Winkler*" for Winkworth; and on pages 301 and 324, "rhythm" for rhyme. The hymn,

"When shall thy love constrain,"

which, in the Wesleyan collection, includes both the 424th and 428th of the present Methodist Episcopal Hymn Book, is thus noticed by Mr. Stevenson: "This is a great favorite with the people, probably arising from the simplicity of the language. Like many of the poet's hymns, the rhythm of this is occasionally imperfect." We have looked in vain for the "imperfect rhythm" of which Mr. Stevenson speaks, and which, in fact, does not exist, neither in this hymn, nor in the "many" others to which he so recklessly alludes. It is a palpable slander upon the prince of sacred lyric poets. The last six stanzas constitute that touchingly tender "penitential cry,"

"And can I yet delay My little all to give?
To tear my soul from earth away For Jesus to receive?"

which has so often cheered our hearts in the days of our "godly sorrow," and caused it to "flee away."

Charles Wesley's sublime Christmas trumpet-call,

"Hark! the herald angels sing,—
Glory to the new-born King,"

is one of the few hymns which are printed at the end of the New Version of the metrical Psalms in the Book of Common Prayer for the use of the Church of England. By what

means it got there has of late troubled and puzzled the muddled brain of many a wiseacre to find out, and among the number must be classed the author of the work under consideration. Mr. Stevenson, taking his cue from Pearson's Oxford Essays, a High Church publication, foolishly enough says, "The only reasonable way of accounting for the remarkable circumstance is, that on one occasion the University printer, having a blank page in the Prayer Book, put in the hymn without either knowing its author, or asking any one's authority for so doing; and once having a place there it is almost impossible to displace it, an act which has been contemplated by some Churchmen since its author has become generally known."

The Churchmen's object is to depreciate the name and fame of the Wesleys, by spreading the idea that nothing written by them was ever authorized or approved by *The Church*. We believe the hymn was inserted in the Prayer Book not by accident, but because of its appropriateness and surpassing excellence; and it is simply disgraceful for a professed Wesleyan, in an authorized work, to second the mean efforts of the enemies of Methodism to injure and dishonor the character of its founders.

The British reader will consult in vain the text of his English copy of Dr. Southey's *Life of Wesley*, referred to on page 92, as that reference is to Harper's American edition of that work, as quoted by Mr. Creamer, and copied unconsciously by Mr. Stevenson. It does not often happen that the plagiarist advertises so conspicuously his literary purloinings.

The present is a proper occasion to notice and condemn the too prevalent practice of literary larceny. The brain work of authors is held fair game for the literary poacher; and some authors and compilers act toward their brothers of the craft in total obliquity of the teaching of both the eighth and tenth precepts of the decalogue. How a follower of Him whose name is Love, and whose character is Truth, can commit such unrighteous deeds, is something that involves a question not easily understood, but of doubtful propriety.

That Mr. Stevenson should fail to notice the valuable work of Rev. W. P. Burgess on "*Wesleyan Hymnology*," either in the preface or body of his book, although it is very evident he made frequent and important use of it, is not only remarkable,

but reprehensible. Mr. Burgess was a pioneer in hymnological lore in England, and for his talents and piety, which were ever usefully employed during a long life, he deserves to be held in respectful remembrance.

Mr. Creamer was likewise the first American author who made the study of Methodist Hymnology a specialty, and for more than a quarter of a century he has ardently prosecuted his favorite pursuit. His work on this subject appeared in 1848, and is still read and appreciated by the lovers of sacred lyric poetry; a subject that is attracting much attention in both countries, and whose admirers are daily increasing. Such works are not to be ignored nor depreciated by any slights which Mr. Stevenson may cast upon them, whatever may be the reason for his censurable conduct.

As indicative of the growing taste and demand for hymnic literature, may be mentioned the publication, by the British Conference, of the complete poetical works of John and Charles Wesley, which are now passing through the London press, and are to be finished in twelve volumes. These will comprise not only all their poetical works which have hitherto issued from the press, but also all the poems and hymns left in manuscript by Charles Wesley at his death. The last four volumes will be composed of these new treasures.

The accomplishment of this great enterprise, which will be completed during the present year, will have the effect not merely to meet in part the increased demand for this kind of reading, but to revive the works of Messrs. Burgess, Holland, and Creamer, and to bring into more general circulation the cognate works of Mesdames Charles, Cox, and Winkworth, and Messrs. Miller, Christophers, Macdonald, Schaff, Saunders, and others. The untrodden field of literature first entered a quarter of a century ago by the authors of "Wesleyan" and "Methodist Hymnology," and which long seemed sterile and unproductive, has at length yielded to modern intellectual husbandry, and the product has been flowers of the sweetest perfume, and fruits of the richest flavor. The harvests already gathered in this department assure the present laborers that their future will be rewarded in the scriptural proportions of thirty, sixty, and a hundred fold.

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

THE ROMAN COUNCIL.—On the 24th of April the Vatican Council confirmed and promulgated the first of the dogmatic decrees which it has under discussion. It is entitled a Dogmatic Decree on Catholic Faith. (*Constitutio Dogmatica de Fide*.) The first draft of it was placed in the hands of the Bishops early in December. After some weeks of private study it was taken up for discussion in the general congregation, held on the 28th of December. At the conclusion of the discussion the draft was referred for emendations to the special committee or deputation on matters of faith, to which were also sent full reports of all the discourses in the discussion. This committee had many meetings, went over the whole matter two or three times, heard the authors of the draft, divided it into two parts, and reported back the first part amended, containing an introduction and four chapters, with canons annexed. This new and revised draft or *schema*, so presented to the Bishops, was again submitted to a renewed discussion and examination—first in general on its plan as a whole, and then by parts. The speeches were very brief, only one of them exceeding half an hour, and several not lasting more than five minutes. All who wished to propose further amendments or changes were required to hand them in in writing. When at length the discussion on any special part was terminated, that portion of the *schema*, and all the proposed amendments, were again referred to the committee. The amendments were printed, and a few days after, in a general congregation, the whole matter would come up for a vote. The committee announced which of the amendments they had accepted, and briefly stated the reasons for which they were unwilling to accept the others. The Bishops then voted on each amendment singly, unless it were withdrawn by its author by a rising vote. It is said that in the discussion of this *schema de fide*, the majority was on every vote so preponderating that an actual count was not necessary, and that only once the Bishops were nearly evenly divided, the important question happening to be

whether the insertion of a certain comma between two words in the text would make the sense more distinct or not. When the introduction, and each one of the chapters, with the accompanying canons, had thus been separately passed on, the entire *schema*, as a whole, was submitted to the fathers for a more solemn and decisive vote in the general congregations held on April 12 and April 19. The vote on this occasion was taken by ayes and noes. This was first done in the congregation on the 12th of April in the following manner: The secretary, from the pulpit, called the prelates one after the other, according to their ranks, and their seniority in their several ranks, naming each one by his ecclesiastical title. The cardinals presiding were called first, the other cardinals next, then the patriarchs, the primates, the archbishops, the bishops, the mitred abbots, and the superiors of the various religious orders and congregations having solemn vows. As each Bishop was called, he rose in his place, bowed to the assembly, and voted. The form was *placet*, if he approved entirely; *placet juxta modum*, if there were any minor points which he was unwilling to approve; or *non placet*, if he disapproved. In the second case, he handed in a written statement of his opinion and vote on that point, and assigned the reasons which moved him to this special view. The assessors of the Council received these manuscripts, and delivered them to the presiding legates. As the name of each one was called, if not present, he was marked absent; if present, and voting, two or three of the officials, stationed here and there in the hall, repeated with clear voices the form of words used by the prelates in voting, so that all might hear them, and that no mistake could be committed as to any one's vote. The whole procedure occupied about two hours. When it was over, the votes were counted before all, and the result declared. The special matter urged in the written and conditional votes were again, and for the last time, examined by the committee or deputation on matters of faith, who reported the result of their discussion in the congregation of April 19, and the precise form of words was settled to be decreed, and published in the third public ses-

sion, which was held on Low Sunday, April 26.

The above account is abridged from the statement of an American priest, (Father Hecker,) who has himself been called to Rome to participate in the labors of the Council. This writer makes no mention whatever of the grave dissensions which are said to have shown themselves even with regard to this point. Other papers, in particular the famous Roman letters of the "Augsburg Gazette," have given the most minute accounts of these dissensions, in particular of a profound excitement which is said to have been produced by Bishop Strossmayer, the most famous name of the opposition. But though it is certain that these accounts are not entirely groundless, it is, with the information as yet accessible to us, impossible to find out to what extent false rumors may be mixed up with the truth, and this, and many other portions of the Council's secret history, must wait for future disclosures.

The official text of the first dogmatic decree of the Vatican Council has already been published. The first impression this document will make upon probably every one outside of the Roman Catholic Church is an astonishment that a meeting of eight hundred and more Bishops should have spent four months in elaborating an essay which many Roman Catholic theologians would have been able to furnish fully as good, if not better, in less than a week. It sets out in an introduction with a description of the good results which have flowed from the Council of Trent, and then turns to the evils which have followed the Reformation. The rejection of the authority of the Church has been followed, the decree says, by the principle of subjecting all things belonging to religion to the judgment of each individual. Thus the original heresies have been broken up into many sects, which differed among themselves, and finally all belief in Christ was overthrown in the minds of not a few, and the sacred Scriptures began to be counted among myths and fables. Then arose the doctrines of Rationalism or Naturalism; and at last the minds of many have fallen into the abyss of Pantheism, Materialism, and Atheism. Not a few even of the children of the Roman Catholic Church have wandered from the true path, wherefore the Pope deems it necessary to profess and declare, in common with the Bishops assembled in Ecumen-

ical Council, from the chair of St. Peter, the saving doctrine of Christ. Then follow the four "chapters." Chapter i, of God the Creator of all things; chapter ii, of revelation; chapter iii, of faith; chapter iv, of faith and reason. To these are added eighteen anathemas against certain heretical opinions concerning these new doctrines. The greater part of the chapters treats on subjects on which Roman Catholics and the Eastern Churches and orthodox Protestant agree against those who deny the Christian revelation; but their common ground is not defined in a manner in any way superior to the many excellent apologetic treatises in which both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant literature abounds. The Roman Catholic laity takes little notice of, and little interest in, such questions; and if the Council had not awaiting its decision some topic of much greater importance, the interest in its progress would soon subside.

But this *schema* on faith is immediately followed by the great question, and, in fact, almost the only question, which secures to the Council a general interest, that of Papal Infallibility. The interest in this question has considerably increased, both within and without the Roman Catholic Church, during the last three months. In fact, it has secured the attention of the civilized world to an unwonted degree. Almost all religious and secular papers, with many thousands of pamphlets and books, have discussed the question in all its aspects. The opinions of the Roman Catholics concerning this question widely differ. A paper, which defends the truth of Papal Infallibility, but doubts the opportuneness of defining it as a dogma, says, that with regard to this question seven parties may be distinguished within the Church. *First*: Those who regard the belief in Papal Infallibility as a necessity, treat the contrary view as heretical, demand a dogmatical promulgation, and seek to promote the latter by all just and many unjust means. Many writers of the Jesuit order, especially those who write for the chief organ of the Ultramontane party, the *Civiltà Cattolica* of Rome, are counted with this class. *Second*: Those who desire the promulgation of the doctrine, but who respect all who oppose it up to the time of the dogmatical definition, as good Catholics. The Bishops who have signed the *postulatum* for the doctrine belong partly to this,

partly to the preceding class. *Third:* Those who personally accept the truth of the doctrine, but deny or doubt the opportuneness of declaring it as an article of faith. It is claimed that the majority of the Bishops who belong to the Oppositor of the Council, especially the German, Austrian, and French Bishops, share this view. The *fourth* class, which comprises the immense majority of the Catholic people, have formed no personal opinion either for or against the doctrine, but confidently leave everything to the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit, who, they believe, will guard the Council from falling into any doctrinal error. The *fifth* class have thus far been unable to convince themselves of the truth of the Infallibility doctrine, but they are ready to accept submissively and cheerfully any decision of the Council whatever it may be. The *sixth* comprises those opponents of Infallibility who regard their view as so irrefutable that they would be tempted to doubt the oecumenical character of a Council which should promulgate such a doctrine, and to repudiate its decisions. Döllinger, it is thought, must be put in this class, and with him many of the prominent scholars who have signed congratulatory and sympathetic addresses to him. Lastly, a *seventh* class goes so far in opposing the Infallibility of the Pope that, indirectly, it throws overboard with it the Infallibility of the Church itself. The famous work of "Jannus" on "The Pope and the Council" is considered a representative work of this shade of opinion.

To complete this picture, the writer should, however, have added, that both in the New and in the Old Worlds many millions are only nominally connected with the Church, and care as little about the Infallibility of the Church as that of the Council. It is, in particular, noteworthy, that most of the men who in France, Belgium, Germany, Austria, and other countries, have been noted as the leaders of the Catholic party in politics have shown themselves as earnest opponents of the doctrine of Infallibility. As regards theological scholars and prominent members of the priesthood, it cannot for a moment be doubted, that the men who have achieved the greatest literary reputation are almost unanimous in a very decided rejection of the proposed doctrine. They fully sustain the position of Döllinger, and it is still ex-

pected that if the majority of the Council should persist in obtruding upon the Church a doctrine which they regard as subverting the whole foundation of the Church, they will not submit.

In the Council the Infallibilists had, from the beginning, an overwhelming majority. A strong indication of this was given by the composition of the important Commission on Dogmatical Questions, which embraces the name of every Bishop who, by writings, influence, or otherwise, had gained a prominent position in the family of the Infallibilists; in particular, Archbishop Manning, of Westminster; Archbishop Deschamps, of Malines; Archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore; Bishop Martin, of Paderborn; Bishop Pie, of Poitiers; the Armenian Patriarch Hassun, of Constantinople. On the other hand, the minority of anti-Infallibilists is not represented in the Commission by a single member. This party of Infallibilists has been greatly strengthened by the open and very emphatic sympathy of the Pope, who has missed no opportunity to censure the opponents and thank and encourage the defenders of the doctrine. The Roman Catholic papers have mentioned many facts of this kind. The author of almost every work in favor of Infallibility has received from the Pope a congratulatory letter, and at the audiences given to Bishops the Pope rarely misses the opportunity to declare it as his opinion that the present state of the Church requires the promulgation of the doctrine.

But overwhelming as was the majority of the Bishops who favored the Infallibility doctrine, and emphatic as was the support given to them by the Pope, many were surprised at the large number of Bishops who openly declared their dissent. Of these, only a few had made known their opinion before the meeting of the Council—foremost among them the veteran champion of Church interests in France, Bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans. Most declared themselves for the first time after their arrival in Rome. At the first, most of the Bishops of the Opposition confined themselves to urging the inopportuneness of declaring Papal Infallibility as a doctrine; but as this failed to make the least impression on the majority, arguments against the doctrine itself have been urged with considerable force. The learned historian of the Council, Bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg, has published a pamphlet on the case of

Pope Honorius, who was declared a heretic by an Ecumenical Council; other pamphlets against the doctrine have been published by Cardinals Rauscher and Schwarzenberg; the Archbishops of St. Louis and Cincinnati have referred to the case of the English Pope Hadrian, who not only gave Ireland to the King of England, but claimed for the Roman Pontiffs the authority to make such donations whenever they pleased. As it takes some time for many of the most important facts connected with this question to become known, we shall, in course of time, learn more of what is now going on in Rome.

An important feature in the history of the Infallibility question is the unanimous opposition of all the governments of the Catholic States. France, Austria, Portugal, Spain, Bavaria, and others, have instructed their ministers in Rome to enter an earnest protest against a doctrine which could compel all members of the Roman Catholic Church to believe in the right of the Pope to depose Kings and release their subjects from the oath of allegiance. It is certain that not a single constitutional government in all Europe will dare to recognize the Infallibility of the Pope, even if the Council should declare it a doctrine of the Church. Thus all those governments will, in the eyes of the Church, become heretical, which may lead to a complete separation between Church and State in all Catholic countries.

THE EASTERN CHURCH—THE BULGARIAN QUESTION.—Among the most important questions which have agitated the Eastern Churches since the beginning of the present century is the reconstruction of a national Bulgarian Church, which is to remain united with the Patriarchate of Constantinople and other parts of the Greek Church in point of doctrine, but to maintain an entire independence in point of administration. This question has obtained a political, as well as an ecclesiastical, importance, as Russia, France, and other European powers have tried to make capital out of it. A decree of the Turkish Government, issued in February, 1870, appears to decide the main point which was at issue. As important results may follow this decision, a brief history of the Bulgarian question will aid in a proper understanding of the situation it now occupies, and of the hopes that are entertained by the

Bulgarians with regard to their future. When the Bulgarians, in the ninth century, under King Bogaris, became Christians, the new missionary Church was placed under the supervision of the Greek Patriarch. About fifty years later King Samuel established both the political independence of the Bulgarian nation and the ecclesiastical independence of the Bulgarian Church. But after his death, the Church was again placed under the Greek Patriarch, and did not regain the enjoyment of ecclesiastical independence till the latter part of the twelfth century. After the conquest of the country by the Turks, in 1393, many of the Bulgarians for a while became, outwardly, Mohammedans; but, as religious freedom increased, returned to their earlier faith, and the Bulgarian Church was made an appendage to that of Constantinople. Good feeling prevailed then between the Greeks and the Bulgarians, and the Sultan filled the Bulgarian Sees with Greek prelates, who were acceptable to the people. As the Bulgarian nobility was exterminated, and the people oppressed by wars which followed, there was, until the beginning of the present century, scarcely a single voice raised against the foreign Episcopate. But the national feeling began to assert itself about fifty years ago, and the Greek Patriarch was compelled to authorize several reforms. Abuses continued, however, and the national feeling increased, so that the Patriarch was obliged, in 1848, to approve the erection of a Bulgarian Church, and of a school for the education of priests, in the capital. The demand of the Bulgarians for a restoration of their nationality, in 1856, again aroused the slumbering zeal of the Greeks, and the differences between the two nationalities have continued very active up to the present time. The Porte, in 1862, named a mixed commission, to investigate and settle the difficulties. It proposed two plans of adjustment. According to one of these plans, the Bulgarian Church was to name the Bishops of those districts in which the Bulgarian population is in a majority. The other plan accorded to the Bulgarians the right to have a Metropolitan in every province, and a Bishop in every diocese, where there is a strong Bulgarian population. Both plans were rejected, and the Turkish Government, having been to considerable pains for nothing, left the contending parties to settle the controversy in their own way.

Accordingly the Greek Patriarch, in 1869, proposed a General Council, and solicited the different Churches of the Greek Confession for their opinions and advice on the subject. Greece, Roumania, and Servia declared themselves in favor of the Council. On the other hand, the Holy Synod of Petersburg, for the Russian Church, declared the claims of the Bulgarians to be excessive, and that, although it considered a Council the only lawful means of settling the points at issue, it feared a schism if the demands of the Bulgarians were complied with, and was further afraid that the fulfillments of the demands of the canons would be refused, and advised the continuance of the *status quo*. The Greek Patriarch, being unwilling to solve the question, the Turkish Government took the matter into its own hands, and in February, 1870, issued a decree which establishes a Bulgarian *Exarch*, to whom are subordinate thirteen Bulgarian Bishops, whose number may be increased whenever it may be found necessary. The Turkish Government has tried to spare the sensibility of the Greeks as much as possible, and has, therefore, not only withheld from the head of the Bulgarian Church the title of Patriarch, but has expressly provided that the Exarch should remain subordinate to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Nevertheless the Patriarch has entered his solemn and earnest protest against the scheme. His note to the Grand Vizier, which is signed by all the members of the Holy Synod of Constantinople, is an important document in the history of the Greek Church, and reads as follows:

To His Highness the Grand Vizier:— Your Highness was pleased to communicate to the Patriarchate, through Messrs Christaki, Efendi, Sagraphras, and Kara-Theodor, the Imperial firman, written upon parchment, which solves the Bulgarian question, after it had been open during ten years. The Patriarchate, always faithfully fulfilling its duties toward the Emperor, whom the Lord God has given to the nations, has at all times remained foreign to any thought that the decrees of the Sublime Sovereign in political questions should not be obeyed. The Oriental Church obeyed with cheerfulness and respect the legitimate Sovereigns. The latter, on their part, have always respected the province which belongs to the ecclesiastical administration. The Sultans, of glorious memory, as well as their present fame-crowned successor,

(whose strength may be invincible,) have always drawn a marked boundary-line between civil and ecclesiastical authority; they recognized the rights, privileges, and immunities of the latter, and guaranteed it by Hatti-Humayums. They never permitted any one to commit an encroachment upon the original rights of the Church, which, during five centuries, was under the immediate protection of the Imperial throne. Your Highness: If the said firman had been nothing but the sanction of a Concordat between the Patriarchate and the Bulgarians, we should respect and accept it. Unfortunately, things are different. Since the firman decides ecclesiastical questions, and since the decision is contrary to the canons, and vitally wounds the rights and privileges of the Holy See, the Patriarchate cannot accept the ultimatum of the Imperial Government. Your Highness: Since the Bulgarians obstinately shut their ears to the voice of that reconciliation which we aim at, and since the Imperial Government is not compelled to solve an ecclesiastical question in an irrevocable manner; since, finally, the abnormal position of affairs violates and disturbs ancient rights, the Œcumenical Patriarchate renews the prayer, that the Imperial Government may allow the convocation of an Œcumenical Council, which alone is authorized to solve this question in a manner legally valid and binding for both parties. Moreover, we beseech the Imperial Government that it may take the necessary steps which are calculated to put an end to the disorder which disturbs the quiet within our flock, and which can chiefly be traced to the circulars of the Heads of the Bulgarians, (dated the 15th of the present month.) The Œcumenical Patriarchate enters its protest with the Imperial Government against the creation of these disturbances. Written and done in our Patriarchal residence, Mar. 24, (old style,) 1870. (Signed) GREGORY CONSTANTINE, Patriarch. (Signed) All the members of the Holy Synod.

The note of the Patriarch and his Synod indicates that they are aware that, sooner or later, the national demands of the Bulgarians must be granted; and their chief concern now is, to obtain as large concessions for the supremacy of the Patriarchal See as is possible. A peaceable and a speedy solution of the difference is the more urgent, as during the last ten years the heads of the Roman Catholic Church in Turkey, aided by the diplomatic agents of the French Government, have made the most strenuous efforts to gain a foothold among the Bulgarians, and to establish a United Bulgarian Church. Nor have these efforts

been altogether unsuccessful. Several years ago the Pope appointed the Bulgarian priest, Sokolski, the first Bishop of those Bulgarians who had entered the union with Rome, and who constituted a nucleus of the United Bulgarian Church, which, like the other united Oriental Churches, accepts the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, but is allowed to retain the ancient customs of the ancient national Church, (marriage of the priests, use of the Slavonic language at divine service, etc.) Bishop Sokolski was quite on a sudden carried off from Constantinople, (as was commonly thought

by Russian agents,) and has never been heard of since. In 1855, Raphael Popof was consecrated successor of Sokolski; he still lives, and, as the only United Bulgarian Bishop, is present at the Vatican Council. He resides at Adrianople, and under his administration the membership of the United Bulgarian Church has increased (up to 1869) to over 9,000 souls, of whom 3,000 live in Constantinople, 2,000 in Salonichi and Monastir, 1,000 in Adrianople, and 3,000 in the vicinity of Adrianople. The clergy of the Church, in 1869, consisted of ten secular priests.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

GERMANY.

A new contribution to Biblical Theology is the work of Lic. Schmidt on the Pauline Christology, in its connection with the doctrine of the Apostle on Salvation. (*Die Paulinische Christologie*. Göttingen, 1870.) In the last chapter the author discusses in a special chapter the Christology of the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians, and finds that the Christological views of these Epistles do not sufficiently differ from those contained in the Epistles which, by general consent, are regarded as genuine, to authorize us to regard these Epistles as spurious. According to the author, the real center of the Pauline Christology is the risen Christ, who, as such, has become a perfect spirit-being. (*Geistwesen*.) The human element appears in him in its perfection, and he possesses as highest dignity that of lord of the congregation. From 1 Cor. xv, 27, the author infers that the idea of a divine nature of Christ was still foreign to Paul.

Among recent biographers of great theologians of Germany, the life of Schleiermacher, by Professor Wilhelm Dilthey, in Kiel, is prominent. (*Lebensgeschichte Schleiermachers*. Vol. I. Berlin, 1870.) The work is to be complete in two volumes, each one of which is to embrace one half of the life of Schleiermacher. The first volume, which has now appeared, extends over the thirty-four years from 1768 to 1802, and thus the time from 1802 to 1834 is left for the

second volume. The author, already known as the editor of the two last volumes of the collection of letters and documents entitled *Aus Schleiermacher's Leben*, has received from the daughter of Schleiermacher, the Countess Schwerin-Putzar, the whole epistolary remains of her father, "a material," he says, "so ample and well arranged, and has hardly been on hand for any similar biography." Thus the author has been enabled to give much that is wholly new. His work is classed by many of its reviewers among the best biographical works of recent German literature.

The earnest opposition of the best Roman Catholic scholars of Germany to the proposed doctrine of Papal Infallibility has already called out several classic works which will live for ever in the history of theological literature; such as the famous work, by Janus, on *The Pope and the Council*. The seat of this Catholic opposition to the Infallibilists is the University of Munich, which counts among its professors Döllinger, Dr. Huber, (the supposed author of Janus,) Dr. Frohschammer, an ex-priest, who has formally renounced the communion of the Church of Rome; Dr. Friedrich, the author of the Church History of Germany; Professor Sepp, the author of a large work, in seven volumes, on the Life of Christ, and many others, who are dreaded by the Ultra-montanes as their most dangerous opponents. A number of the scholars of this liberal school have united in publishing a

collection of pamphlets and books, entitled, *Stimmen aus der Kath. Kirche über Kirchenfragen der Gegenwart*, (Voices from the Catholic Church on Ecclesiastical Questions of the Present Day,) for enlightening the Catholic people of Germany on "genuine Christianity and true Catholicism," and for warning it against Ultramontanism. The authors have published their prospectus, in which they urge the necessity of a purification of the Church—that is, of an elimination of the Church of all heterogeneous elements which are foreign to her original consciousness and to her original constitution. In case the Council, which is convoked by Pius IX., should not effect this purification of the Church; if it should, on the contrary, produce a broad division within the Catholic Church; if, what would be the greatest misfortune, the Jesuit school doctrines should prevail over the primitive faith of the Church, even then, says the prospectus, "we shall not abandon our hope, but remain firm in the belief that the Lord will never abandon his Church, and that consequently, a momentary obfuscation of the consciousness of the Church, occasioned as it is by illegal measures, must be followed by a final enlightening." The first work of the collection, which already has appeared, has been prepared by Professor Huber, and is entitled, "Pope and State." (*Papstthum und Staat*.) It was to be immediately followed by a reprint of the letters of Dr. Dollinger, in the *Augsburg Gazette*, on the Infallibility Address, and the new By-laws of the Council; and by a special treatise on the Infallibility question by the Rev. Cl. Schmitz, entitled, *Ist der Papst persönlich unfehlbar?* (Is the Pope personally infallible?) It is expected that a large number of the most prominent scholars of Germany will prepare works for this collection.

The sufferings of the Messiah, in their agreement with the doctrines of the Old Testament and the sayings of the Rabbis in the Talmud, Midraschim, and other old Rabbinical writings, (*Die Leiden des Messias*. Lubeck, 1870.) is the title of a work by Dr. A. Wünsche. It is written from an orthodox point of view. The title indicates the contents.

A new contribution to Biblical Theology is the work of Dr. Kahle on Biblical Eschatology, (*Biblische Eschatologie*. Gotha, 1870.) The first volume which has

appeared treats of the Eschatology of the Old Testament.

Dr. Thiersch, who, notwithstanding his connection with the sect of the Irvingites, is respected by the Protestant Churches of Germany as one of the foremost representatives of the orthodox school of theological science, has published a new work on Genesis, explaining it "according to its moral and prophetic sense." (*Die Genesis*. Basel, 1870.)

One of the famous works of German theological literature, the Introduction to the Old Testament, by the late Dr. Wette, has been published in an entirely revised edition, (the 8th,) by Professor Schrader, of Giessen. The new editor is already known by other works as an able exegetical writer, and this new edition of an old standard work is highly commended in the theological papers of Germany. (*Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einleitung*. Berlin, 1869.)

FRANCE.

A highly important archaeological discovery of the present year, the inscription on the triumphal column of the Moabite King, Mesha, is copied and described in a letter, addressed by the discoverer, Charles Clermont Ganneau, dragoman of the French consulate of Jerusalem, to Count de Vogüé, who has long been favorably known by his thorough knowledge of Semitic paleography. The pamphlet (*La Stèle de Mesa, roi de Moab, 896 avant J. C.* Paris, 1870) briefly recounts the circumstances which led to the recovery of the inscription, and after the destruction of the stone by the Bedouins, to a restoration of the text, gives a fac-simile of the thirty-four lines of the inscription, transcribes it in Hebrew characters, and adds a French translation with some remarks on the age of the inscription, and a map of ancient Moab, in which all the towns mentioned in the map are given. It is to be followed by a commentary. There are many gaps in the inscription, especially in its first part, because the proprietors of the stone, the Beni-Hamde, fearing an interference of the Turks in their affairs, shattered the stone to pieces. Ganneau could use an impression of the whole inscription, but it is illegible in many places. It is, however, hoped that in the course of time the Bedouins will be prevailed upon by offers of money

to sell all the fragments of the stone. The inscription is particularly interesting, it being the most ancient document now known composed in an alphabetical writing. The contents of the inscription make it almost certain that the column was erected in the year 896 B.C. The language of the inscription is Hebrew; among the slight variations is the use of the plural ending *n* instead of *m*. It contains but few words not found in the Old Testament. As was to be expected, the inscription has already called forth a number of articles and pamphlets from the Semitic scholars. Ganneau himself publishes a second facsimile, which is much more complete than the one contained in the above pamphlet, in the March number of the *Revue Archeologique*. Ernest Renan has published an interesting article on it in the *Journal des Debats*. In Germany, an essay (*Die Siegestsäule Mesa's Königs der Moabiter*. Halle, 1870) has been published on the inscription by the distinguished Orientalist, Constantine Schlottmann, who is already favorably known as a decipherer of Phœnician inscriptions; and in the *Augsburg Gazette*, Dr. Haug has furnished a German translation, with some critical remarks.

Dr. Ad. Schaffer, already favorably known by several works on Church history, has published a work on the Hugue-

nots of the 16th Century. (*Les Huguenots du XVI. Siècle*. Paris, 1870.) The object of the author is not to give a new history of French Protestantism, on which subject we have a number of excellent works, but to describe the inner life of the first followers of the Reformation. He speaks of them as members of the family, as citizens of the State, in peace and war, in joy and suffering, in life and death. He gives numerous extracts from many sources which he has made use of, both Protestant and Roman Catholic.

BELGIUM.

One of the largest works which has been produced by Belgium is that by Professor F. Laurent, of the University of Ghent, entitled, *Etudes sur l'Histoire de l'Humanité*. The seventeenth volume of the work was published last year under the special title, *Le Catholicisme et la religion de l'Avenir*. 1 Serie. (Paris, 1869.) The author believes in some kind of Rationalistic Christianity as the religion of the future; the most important portion of his book is that which shows the irreconcilable gulf existing between Roman Catholicism and the civilization of the present age. The author shows a very thorough acquaintance with the recent history of Roman Catholicism, and in this respect his work is a very valuable store-house of facts.

ART. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, April, 1870. (New York.)—1. Nature and Prayer. 2. Is this a Christian Nation? 3. Sin and Suffering in the Universe. 4. Christianity Capable of Self-Defense. 5. Biblical Theology, with Especial Reference to the New Testament. 6. Missionaries, and British Relations with China. 7. The Ground and Nature of Christian Giving. 8. A New Analysis of Fundamental Morals. 9. Recent German Works in Theology and Biblical Literature.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, April, 1870. (Philadelphia.)—1. Greek Text of the Apocalypse. 2. The Malay Archipelago. 3. The Temptation of Jesus. 4. Sex in Nature and Society. 5. The Future Life. 6. Church Polity. 7. Exegetical Studies.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, April, 1870. (New York.)—1. The Element of Time in Interpreting the Ways of God. 2. Pantheism as a Phase in Philosophy and Theory of History. 3. Memoir of Dr. Raffles. 4. The Relation

of Adam's First Sin to the Fall of the Race. 5. The Witness of Paul to Christ. 6. The Christian giving for the Times. 7. Brief Suggestions on Presbyterian Reconstruction and Unification. 8. Recent Publications on the School Question.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, April, 1870. (Andover.)—1. Psychology in the Life, Work, and Teachings of Jesus. 2. A Fourth Year of Study in the Courses of Theological Seminaries. 3. Doctrine of the Trinity. 4. The Year of Christ's Birth. 5. The Silence of Women in the Churches. 6. Prophecy as Related to the "Eastern Question."

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, April, 1870. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Doctrine of Scripture as to the Relation of Baptism and the Remission of Sins. 2. Development. 3. The Bible in the Public Schools. 4. The Philosophy of Faith. 5. The Rise and Establishment of the Papacy. 6. Does the New Testament Determine the Elements of the Public Worship?

NEW ENGLANDER, April, 1870. (New Haven.)—1. The Council of Constance and the Council of the Vatican. 2. A Critical Examination of Professor Huxley's "Physical Basis of Life." 3. Is the Doctrine of the Final Restoration of all Men Scriptural? 4. Memoirs of Alexander Campbell. 5. Christianity a Universal Religion. 6. The Proprieties of the Pulpit. 7. The New Criticism.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, April, 1870. (Boston.)—1. The Murray Centenary. 2. Everitt's Logic. 3. Schleiermacher's Christology. 4. The First Universalist Church. 5. Our Sunday-Schools. 6. Priest and Prophet. 7. Collective Judgments.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, April, 1870. (Boston.)—1. The Physics and Physiology of Spiritualism. 2. Parkman's Discovery of the Great West. 3. Darwinism in Germany. 4. The Legal-Tender Act. 5. Poverty and Public Charity. 6. The Norman Conquest of England. 7. Ténor's Coup d'Etat. 8. The Prospects of the Political Art.

The "North American" has much reduced its oppressive magnitude without reducing its price. It has furnished a number of able articles on the political and commercial moralities of our day. It is Deistic as ever, though much improved by the cessation of the peculiarities of Charles E. Norton.

The first article by the noted Dr. W. A. Hammond accounts correctly enough for a large amount of the phenomena of spiritualism upon natural principles, but incorrectly assumes to cover all classes of cases. As a solution of some of the forms of apparent supernaturalism it has value. In the following queer paragraph Dr. Hammond charges "Methodists" with "desecrating churches:—" "It is a striking fact, which would be laughable but for the frequently lamentable results which ensued, that while the Catholic ecstasies inveighed against the heretical sects which were springing up on all sides, and consigned them to torture and the flames, these, the Calvinists, Camisards, Pre-adamites, Jumpers, Anabaptists, Quakers, Methodists, Tremblers, etc., etc., denounced the Pope as Antichrist, desecrated churches, and exhibited a ferocity which in its sanguinary character has rarely been equaled." The "North American" does not elevate itself by tolerating the drivel of such a writer.

In the third article Mr. Charles L. Brace (author of "The Races of the Old World") reports that Darwinism is accepted, "either in part or in whole," by "nearly all the scientific thinkers of England." "In France," he says, "the influence of Cuvier has prevented its just consideration, and only "two celebrated botanists" have avowed a belief of the "changeability of species." In Germany the Atheists have hailed it with rapture, and pushed it to extremes Mr. Darwin would not accept. They exaggerate the resemblance of the simian and human brains, affirming their almost identity. At this point Mr. Brace executes a fine flank movement upon them. If the crania of the ape and man are so nearly alike, then the stupendous spiritual difference between the two races must lie in something besides material structure. This argument Mr. Brace expands with excellent effect. But in our view Mr. Brace is mistaken in maintaining that the Paleyan "argument from design" has lost its validity, even though he also maintains that the Theistic argument becomes equally strong in another form—a form which he illustrates in clear and eloquent style.

♦ ♦ ♦

English Reviews.

- BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, April, 1870. (London.)—1. Our Lord's First and Last Discourses. 2. Henry Ainsworth. 3. Recent Christian Biography—James Hamilton and William Chalmers Burns. 4. Ezekiel's Place in the Old Testament Church. 5. The Climax of Messianic Prophecy in Isaiah liii. 6. Lecky's History of European Morals from Augustine to Charlemagne. 7. Old Mortality. 8. The Counter-Imputations.
- EDINBURGH REVIEW, April, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Viceroyalty of Lord Lawrence. 2. Juana la Loca. 3. M. de Parieu on Taxation. 4. Eastlake and Gibson. 5. Non-restraint in the Treatment of the Insane. 6. Smith's Tour in Portugal. 7. Renan's St. Paul. 8. The Epic of Arthur. 9. Ballot not Secret Voting. 10. Earl Russell's Speeches.
- LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The English Bible. 2. Lanfrey's Napoleon. 3. The Church in Wales. 4. Sir Charles Eastlake and the English School of Painting. 5. Non-Historic Times. 6. The Education of the People. 7. Mr. Froude's Queen Elizabeth. 8. Annals of an Eventful Life. 9. Government Dealing with Irish Crime.
- LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1870. (London.)—1. Mr. Forster's Education Bill. 2. Raphael and his Times. 3. The Catholic Apostolic Church. 4. Ancient Irish Literature. 5. Life and Remains of Robert Lee. 6. The Laureate and his "Arthuriad." 7. Winer's Greek Testament Grammar.
- NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, April, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. The Church Policy of Constantine. 2. Earl Godwin and Earl Harold. 3. The Early Author of Shakspeare. 4. The Will and Free-will. 5. Jane Austen. 6. Parties and Politics of Modern Russia. 7. The Home Policy of the Session.
- WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1870. (Scott's Republication, New York, 140 Fulton-street.)—1. Unpublished Letters written by Samuel Taylor Coleridge. 2. American Socialisms. 3. The Paraguayan War. 4. The English Parliament and the Irish Land. 5. The Imperial Library of Paris. 6. Pauper Girls. 7. Prostitution: How to Deal with it. 8. The Action of Natural Selection on Man.

German Reviews.

STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Essays and Reviews.) Edited by Dr. Hundeshagen and Dr. Riehm. 1870. Third Number. *Essays*: 1. DOEDES, [Professor in Utrecht, Holland,] Historical and Literary Remarks on the Biography of John Wessel. 2. VAHINGER, List of the Stations on the March of the Children of Israel through the Desert. 3. KREYHER, Zwingli and Calvin's Views on Predestination. *Thoughts and Remarks*: 1. SCHRADER, [Professor in Giessen,] Sargon and Shalmanezer. *Reviews*: 1. DIESTEL, History of the Old Testament in the Christian Church, Reviewed by RIEHM. 2. WEISS, Manual of the Biblical Theology of the New Testament, Reviewed by KOHLER.

The first article, by a distinguished theologian of evangelical Protestantism in the Netherlands, contains some interesting contributions to the history of John Wessel, who is commonly regarded as one of the most prominent forerunners of the Reformation among the Germanic nations.

In the article on Sargon and Shalmanezer, Professor Schrader, of Giessen, who is already favorably known among theological scholars as the editor of a new edition of the Introduction of De Wette to the Old Testament, combats the opinion of Dr. Riehm, in a former number of the *Studien*, according to which the names Sargon and Shalmanezer denote the same Assyrian king. Schrader agrees with Ewald, Hilzig, Delitzsch, the Rawlinsons, Oppert, and other writers on this subject, that Shalmanezer was the predecessor of Sargon, and reigned from 727 to 723 B. C.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. Journal for Scientific Theology. Edited by Professor Hilgenfeld. 1870. Third Number.—1. HILGENFELD, Gnosticism, and the New Testament. 2. SCHWEIZER, A Recent Work on Pauline Christology. 3. E. ZELLER, Remarks on Romans viii, 3. 4. HILGENFELD, Reply to Professor Wieseler's Remarks on the Prophet Ezra. 5. EGLI, Critical Remarks on the Text of Exodus.

The first article is one of the most important ones which have for some time appeared in this organ of the Tübingen school. Professor Hilgenfeld claims to have been the first to trace the influence of Gnosticism upon the transformation of the early Christian Church. He finds clear references to Gnostic ideas in several books of the New Testament; and as he holds, on the other hand, that Gnosticism did not yet exist at the time of the Apostles, he must regard those references as arguments against the Apostolic origin of the books in which they are contained. These views were first developed by him twenty-one years ago; he now presents them again, revised and enlarged. The negative views of the Tübingen school have lost ground in Germany during the last twenty years; but Professor Hilgenfeld is generally respected as one of its most learned representatives, and essays like the above will be sure to be studied by theological scholars of all schools,

though they rest so much on guesses and combinations, that the author can expect but very limited assent, even from those who agree with his theological views. The article treats, first, of the Gnostics in the Apostolic age; second, Paulinism and Gnosticism; third, the Deutero-Johannean writings—by this name Hilgenfeld designates the Epistles and the Gospel of John, all of which, according to him, were compiled about A. D. 135; fourth, the latest writings of the New Testament. These, according to Hilgenfeld, are the Epistle of Judas and the Second Epistle of Peter.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DIE HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. Journal for Historical Theology. Edited by Dr. Kahnis. 1. RATZ, What Luther Gained from Melancthon. 2. BOEHMER, Francisci Dryandri, Hispani, Epistolæ Quinquaginta. 3. SCHNEIDER, Jacob Neidinger, A Document of the Time of the Religious War in the Palatinate. 4. LINDER, Brief Historical Introduction to the Sermon of H. Erzberger, delivered on Christmas, 1570.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE. (Christian Review,) March 5, 1870.—1. HOLLOND, The Quakers, Essay on the First Years of their Society. 2. LELIEVRE, The Last Council. 3. PRESSENSE, An Address on the Free Conscience. 4. Correspondence from Rome.

April 5.—1. E. DE GUERLE, The Right of Women in the Novels of the Present Age. 2. HOLLOND, The Quakers, (second article.) 3. LICHTENBERGER, The Lutheran Church in Alsace.

May 5.—HOLLOND, The Quakers, (third article.) 2. PEYRE, M. Rognon. 3. DOURMERQUE, The Philosophy of the Works of Molière.

REVUE THEOLOGIQUE. (Theological Review.) Published under the direction of C. Babut, Pastor at Nîmes; C. Bois, Professor Theological Faculty of Montauban; T. Bonifas, Professor Theological Faculty of Montauban; R. Hollard, Pastor at Paris; T. Lichtenberger, Professor Theological Faculty of Strasburg; J. Monod, Professor Theological Faculty of Montauban; E. de Pressensé, Pastor at Paris; A. Sabatier, Professor Theological Faculty of Strasburg. First Year. No. 1. March, 1870. 1. CH. BYSE, Authority in Matters of Faith. 2. WARNITZ, Did the Apostle John stay in Ephesus? 3. G. MEYER, The Son of Man and the Son of God. 4. RIVIER, Remarks on Romans v, 12.

In *Revue Theologique* is the continuation of the *Bulletin Theologique*, a quarterly which, during nineteen years, had been the literary supplement to the *Revue Chretienne*, the excellent organ of the Free Evangelical Churches of France. As the names of the editors indicate, the Free Evangelical Church has united with the orthodox school of the two Protestant State Churches, so that the new review may be regarded as the common organ of French Evangelical Protestantism. Pressensé's name alone suffices as a guarantee that the new Review will bring contributions which will deserve and receive the attention of theological students of every country.

ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Christianity and Greek Philosophy; or, The Relation between Spontaneous and Reflective Thought in Greece, and the Positive Teachings of Christ and his Apostles. By B. F. COCKER, D.D., Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan. Pp. 531. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

The particular field traversed in the work before us may be best set forth in the author's own words:

In preparing the present volume, the writer has been actuated by a conscientious desire to deepen and vivify our faith in the Christian system of truth, by showing it does not rest *solely* on a special class of facts, but upon all the facts of nature and humanity; that its authority does not repose *along* on the peculiar and supernatural events which transpired in Palestine, but also on the still broader foundations of the ideas and laws of the reason, and the common wants and instinctive yearnings of the human heart. It is his conviction that the course and constitution of nature, the whole current of history, and the entire development of human thought, in the ages anterior to the advent of the Redeemer, center in, and can only be interpreted by, the purpose of redemption.

Such is the elevated Christian stand-point from whence the author descends to his labor. More particularly he says, in regard to the dominant thought and purpose of the book:

The central and unifying thought of this volume is, that the necessary ideas and laws of the reason, and the native instincts of the human heart, originally implanted by God, are the primal and germinal forces of history, and that these have been developed under conditions which were first ordained, and have been continually supervised by the providence of God.

No more appropriate nor richer example, in the history of human thought, could have been selected to illustrate or enforce this general statement than that comprehended under the title of "Greek Philosophy." The starting-point, if not the sanction, of the work is derived from Paul's discourse from Mars Hill, Athens. In reading we are constantly reminded of Dr. Whewell's "History of Scientific Ideas," arising out of some similarity of purpose or plan.

In a brief notice such as this it is impossible to do more than give the merest outline of the plan of a work so full of matter. We therefore waive any attempt at a critical analysis and estimate of its contents. This would require, and merits, the space of a long article.

The volume is divided into fifteen chapters. The first is devoted to "Athens and the Men of Athens." The second sets forth, under the head "Philosophy of Religion," the principles the author employs in subsequent parts of the work. This prepares the way, in the two succeeding chapters, for a consideration of the "Relig-

ion of the Athenians." The next three chapters, beginning with Paul's notice of an altar to the "unknown God" at Athens, are entirely devoted to a critical examination of the "Philosophy of the Unconditioned," as held by Sir William Hamilton, Dr. Mansell, and others, in which, against these thinkers, he coincides with Cousin, Martineau, etc., in affirming "God is cognizable by human reason." We suppose this part of the volume was written for the sake of evolving the principles in the light of which the relations of "Greek Philosophy to Christianity" might be determined. We cannot, however, avoid feeling that much of the matter in these three chapters would more appropriately have fallen in the forthcoming volume. Of the remaining eight chapters, six are devoted to the "Philosophers of Athens," beginning with Thales, Anaximenes, Heraclitus, Anaximander, Leucippus, and Democritus, of the "pre-Socratic school," whose influence was predominant at Athens at the time Christianity was introduced into Europe. The discussion of the tenets and characteristics of the various schools of Greek philosophy is conducted with admirable spirit and marked ability. The last two chapters are occupied in a consideration of the "propædæutic"—or preparatory—office of Greek philosophy in relation to Christianity. This is well done, and forms a fitting conclusion to the volume.

On almost every page we find matter for comment. The author shows a well-defined purpose, and never loses sight of it from beginning to end. It shines out every-where. The book is strong, coherent, and highly suggestive. Strong, rather than acute, analytic power, and an excellent faculty for broad, luminous generalization is manifested. The work is characterized by a vigorous, compact, and, considering the nature of the subject, a rather animated style. The author displays a profound knowledge of his difficult subject, and what is especially necessary in a critic and interpreter of philosophical systems, great candor and independence of thought, and a generous, manly sympathy. In Psychology he is a thorough Intuitionalist, standing apparently on the same platform as Cousin and Martineau.

It is with no ordinary pleasure we welcome such an addition to our growing Methodist literature. We can do nothing more than heartily to commend the work to every minister of the Gospel and thoughtful reader as one that will abundantly repay diligent perusal. We will await impatiently the appearance of the second volume, and an adequate estimate of the present, by some content hand, in the pages of the *Quarterly*.

Textual Corrections of the Common English Version in the New Testament. (Covenant.) According to the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts. With the other Ancient Manuscripts, and the Editions of the Vulgate, the Complutensian Polyglot, Stephens, the Elziris, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alvord. 12mo., pp. 49. New York: John Wiley & Son. 1870.

This little manual proposes to enable the ordinary reader of our English Bible to correct its text according to the highest authorities, furnishing in the most compact form the entire net results of criticism thus far in this department.

First, we have a brief history of the Greek text, from the day of Erasmus down to the present hour, written by Dr. Tregelles, similar in form (but more abridged) to the two articles lately furnished in our *Quarterly*. Next, we have a chapter arguing in favor of the revision of our common version. Then comes the main matter of the work. Thirty-one manuscripts (including "the four great authorities," the Sinaitic, the Vatican, the Alexandrian, and the Ephraim) are enumerated, and nine editors and editions, as sources of comparison. We have, then, a synopsis of all the passages required to be changed by the two highest authorities, the Sinaitic and the Vatican; and the names, in abbreviation, of the editors adopting the alteration. This synopsis it is proposed to extend through the whole New Testament, provided the success of the present issue indicates sufficient public interest in the subject to make it pay expenses. To the increasing number of our scholars interested in a pure text, this brings the entire series of well-authorized emendations of the received text into the most compressed possible form, though many, perhaps, would prefer the readings in the Greek.

An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., of the Oratory. 12mo., pp. 479. New York: Catholic Publication Society. 1870.

Dr. Newman is considered as the ablest of the number of scholarly English divines who have made a transit from the Anglican to the Roman Church. The present volume, though frequently assuming incidentally the truth of Romanism, is liberal in its tone, and written, not with a sectarian, but a generally Christian end.

It is an essay exhibiting the legitimate process of framing conclusions in proportion to evidence. It properly belongs to the department of logic, both theoretical and disciplinary. It abounds with disquisition at once subtle and entertaining, illustrated with numerous striking examples in literature and history. The principles obtained are then applied with no little force to our con-

clusions in regard to religion, and the work becomes an able volume of Christian evidence. It may be recommended to reflective men of all classes.

New Cyclopædia of Illustrations, adapted to Christian Teaching: Embracing Mythology, Analogies, Legends, Parables, Emblems, Metaphors, Similes, Allegories, Proverbs; Classic, Historic, and Religious Anecdotes, etc. By Rev. ELON FOSTER. With an Introduction by Rev. STEPHEN H. TYNG, D.D. 8vo., pp. 704. New York: W. C. Palmer, Jr., & Co. 1870.

The preacher who makes his sermons of patchwork is little likely to produce any masterpieces. Sermons made from quotation-books are on a level with poems made with a rhyming dictionary. A true sermon, like a true poem, flows forth in rich, spontaneous streams from a full mind and a warm heart. So far forth as this book is intended as a sermon help, we would sooner burn it than buy it. But for those who need and will use such aids, we may say that this is one of the best specimens of its class, being immeasurably superior to the cart-loads of homiletic chips in Schaff's Lange.

Essays on Some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion. By RICHARD WHATELY, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. From the Seventh London Edition. 12mo., pp. 312. Andover: Warren F. Draper. New York: Felt & Dillingham. 1870.

Whately, though possessing little imagination, has justly maintained a high rank as a patient, subtle, individualistic Christian thinker. The present volume presents five essays on topics connected mostly with the New Testament. To these is added his celebrated historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Bonaparte. This piece unites *jeu d'esprit* and theological argument in a very unique manner. It is a humorous disproof of the credibility of the history of Napoleon, on the same ground as Hume uses in invalidating the history of Jesus.

Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D., and JAMES STRONG, S.T.D. Vol. III. E—F—G. 8vo., pp. 1,048. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The fact that this Cyclopædia is already extensively quoted in the highest quarters as a standard authority decides its position in the literary and religious world. The only drawback upon it is its slow completion—slow in view of the expectation and the convenience of the public, not slow in view of the magnitude of the work.

The Wise Men. Who they were, and How they Came to Jerusalem. By FRANCIS W. UPHAM, LL.D., Professor in Rutgers Female College, New York. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1868.

In this little monograph Professor Upham has been singularly felicitous in concentrating a large amount of new knowledge and fresh criticism upon a very old and difficult question. It is not only an original contribution to biblical literature, but a fascinating book for the inquiring reader. No writer hereafter should discuss the "star" without consulting the Professor.

The Life of our Lord. By Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, D.D., LL.D. In six volumes. *The Close of the Ministry.* 12mo., pp. 351. *The Passion Week.* 12mo., pp. 344. *The Last Day of our Lord's Passion.* Pp. 379. *The Forty Days after our Lord's Resurrection.* 12mo., pp. 316. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1870.

These four volumes constitute sections of the great Life which has fascinated the thought of the world for centuries, without losing any share of its mystery and glory. Dr. Hanna has given us, in a free, fresh, popular style, the results of ripe scholarship and eminent power.

Foreign Theological Publications.

Des alten Nikolaus Hunnius Glaubenslehre der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche. [Doctrinal System of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Nicholas Hunnius.] Bearbeitet von FRIEDRICH BAUER. 3te verbesserte Auflage. 8vo., pp. lxxix 418. Nördlingen: Beck. 1870.

The recovery of the Doctrinal System of Nicholas Hunnius from the obscurity in which it had lain nearly a century and a half was commenced in 1844, when Dean Brandt issued a new edition of it. Singularly enough, it was done in the interest of a mission to America, missionaries for which were under the special care of Pastor Löhe, who had incited the editor to address himself to the enterprise. In 1850 a second edition appeared, and just now we have the third, a very decided improvement upon its predecessors. Nicholas Hunnius, the author, was born in 1585, and came honestly by his decided Lutheran proclivities and dogmatical tastes, for his father was the celebrated Ægidius Hunnius, first a Professor of Theology in Marburg, and later in Wittenberg, at that time the citadel of German Protestantism. His son's principal literary performance, the work now before us, is a clear and frank statement of Lutheranism without any compromise with Calvinism or any other confession. It is what the High Lutherans still believe, and teach their theological candidates. We first have the editor's interesting biographical sketch of the author. The work proper then opens with a Doctrinal Introduction, which, according to our notion, is the most valuable part of the volume.

After stating the fact that the Scriptures abound in figurative language, biblical figures are arranged rhetorically, as follows: Trope, synecdoche, metonymy, metaphor, allegory, comparison, parable, proverb, personification, symbol, typical, symbolico-dogmatical, anti-typical, and sacramental expressions, and vision. The Introduction treats, further, of locality and space in the invisible and future world, Antichrist, and the stages in the order of salvation.

The main divisions are: Doctrine of God; Creation; Sin; Election; Person of Christ; Christ's Humiliation and Glorification; Christ's Work; Order of Salvation; Means of Grace; Church and the Ministry; Eschatology. We find here and there, in the treatment of these topics, points from which the Lutheran Church, as we find it now, has decidedly diverged. The Lutheran systematic theologian of our day would hardly enforce the duty of the Christian to be perfect, as we here find it, (p. 161;) while, on the other hand, his present mode of defining repentance is much less open to objection than that of Hunnius: that repentance consists in sorrow for sin and faith in Christ, but that the confession of sin is not an element of true repentance, (pp. 163-165.) *Ergo*, faith precedes confession. As to the necessity of repentance by every body, Hunnius is very positive and lucid. His statement of what the real Christian does, when partaking of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is likewise clear, and not far out of the way: 1. That he confesses, by public participation, his general belief in the doctrines taught in his Church. 2. That he pledges himself to continue faithful to his Master to the end, and to contend, even at the risk of his life, for his honor. 3. That he obligates himself to live in happy union with other Christians, that all may be one body in Christ. Of course we should expect the doctrine of baptismal regeneration to occupy a prominent place here, and are not disappointed. "Baptism is not a sign, but a means, of regeneration. . . . But any thing which is not water—as milk, beer, wine, mead, and such things—is not appropriate for baptism, for none of these were mentioned at the institution of baptism, or used by the Apostles. Neither can any one know whether God would effect regeneration by any such means, and let it pass as a real baptism." (Pp. 239, 248.) We fear that the Lutheran of our day would hardly consider the following a satisfactory proof of his still unmitigated doctrine of consubstantiation: "Christ has commanded that his body should be eaten with the mouth, and his blood should be drunk with the mouth.

Hence we infer that what we human beings should, in the Lord's Supper, eat with the mouth and drink with the mouth, is actually present as a material part of this spiritual meal." (P. 270.) Why, then, we ask, call it a *spiritual* meal? Give it its appropriate name, and call it a *material* one.

Leitfaden der christlichen Glaubenslehre für Kirche, Schule, und Haus. (Elements of Christian Doctrine for the Church, the School, and the Home.) Von Dr. J. T. BECK, Professor der Theologie in Tübingen. 2te Auflage. 8vo., pp. xl, 636. Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf. 1869.

Dr. Beck is at present the leading theologian of Tübingen University, and is contributing largely toward redeeming that institution from the unenviable reputation given it by the late Ferdinand Christian Baur and^a his semi-skeptical school. Dr. Beck is, in most respects, a model professor of theology, the Tholuck of South Germany. If this were the place, we should have something to say on his peculiar ideas—altogether out of keeping with our century—on the propriety of letting the truth gain its victories in a quiet way, by its own naturally permeating and leavening power, without making special efforts for its propagation. It is too late in the day to relax earnest missionary effort, or faith in its absolute necessity and ultimate success.

The work is based on the three great ideas of Faith, Charity, and Hope. Faith assumes the invisible truth as something having an independent and self-communicating existence; still, it has not a merely outward form, but first comes to our knowledge, and is accepted by faith. Love, or Charity, applies Faith, and gives it an independent relation; it adapts Faith's knowledge of the truth to obedience to the truth. Hope awaits the coming fulfillment, and assumes the future life in the Spirit. The knowledge of the truth which Faith carries with it, and the obedience to the truth which love effects, become freedom in the truth by the things which Hope promises.

The author, in accordance with this plan, divides his doctrinal system into the Doctrine of Faith, the Doctrine of Love, and the Doctrine of Hope. The present work treats only of the first: the second has been considered in a separate treatise, *Christliche Sittenlehre*, (published in 1839 and 1842;) the third, in which the sacraments are to be examined, is to follow. The first part of the work before us is original matter, and the second contains only the scriptural citations, in full, referred to in the first. Contents: Introduction: Fundamental Historical Thoughts. 1. The Holy Scriptures. 2. The Christian Faith as a positive religion.

3. The obligation at baptism to Christian faith. The Doctrinal System. 1. The divine creation of the world, with its divine order. 2. The non-divine fall, with its divine legislation. 3. The divine redemption of the world, with its order of grace. "Religion," says Dr. Beck, "is faith in and worship of God, and the Christian religion is faith in and the worship of God according to his salvation in the name of Jesus Christ." Accordingly, Christ is the very beginning and end of all true religion, the very essence of all scriptural truth, the object of all that can be called faith. To reject Christ is to reject all revelation, and to renounce all claim to faith. The view of sin, as here laid down, is hardly in harmony with the rest of the author's system. Evil is sin dwelling in man; man *has* in himself and *commits* sin, but the whole man is not sin. He cannot be called sinful, in the sense that he had no more good in himself, and does not do it, but only in the sense that there is a sinful element in all that he does, that *he has and does nothing absolutely good*. The nature of man has not become sin. *Sin only is something which cleaves to him.*

♦ ♦ ♦

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

The Laws of Discursive Thought; being a Text-Book of Formal Logic. By JAMES M'COSH, LL.D., President of New Jersey College, Princeton, etc. 12mo., pp. 212. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Logic for High Schools and Colleges. By A. SCHUYLER, M.A., Professor of Mathematics and Logic in Baldwin University. 12mo., pp. 168. Cincinnati: Wilson, Hinkle, & Co.

Professor Schuyler has written a clear, concise text-book, setting forth all the Hamiltonian "improvements," with their corresponding notation and symbols, embracing brief criticisms thereon from Thompson and De Morgan, with Hamilton's vindication in reply. Fig. IV, with all its moods, is here also found once more claiming its ancient niche on historic grounds, whether there are others or not. Every thing is presented clearly, though the manner is highly formal and technical. The book has a very algebraic look, bristling with formulas, and quite thoroughly illustrated by Euler's circles. Rectangles seem better adapted to illustrate extension than circles. The analysis of the science is very thorough, but generally so bare as to demand much effort and enthusiasm from the teacher. The book looks very bony, but we have no doubt that Professor Schuyler makes it live. Let him dress the skeleton in some of his lecture-room homilies, and it will be more winsome.

The work of Dr. M'Cosh is an attempt to ingraft upon the Aristotelian system all that is valuable in the Hamiltonian analysis, at the same time avoiding its errors and defects. Dr. M'Cosh shows that the errors of Mill and the Comteans on the one hand, and of Hamilton and the Kantians on the other, have arisen mainly from defective or altogether erroneous ideas on the nature of *notions*, or the elements of the judgment, the "concepts" of Hamilton, the "names" of Mill, and the "terms" of Whately and others. Hence Part I, embracing nearly one half of the work, is devoted to the discussion of the notion. He takes issue at the start with the Kantian postulate that the forms of thought are subjectively determined, and that logic is consequently *à priori* science, showing that this is the error that runs through the whole Hamiltonian system. The author holds, on the contrary, that the science is to be constructed only by a careful inductive investigation of the operations of the mind in thinking. Hence, while the Kantian would start *à priori*, from the unconsciously operating laws of thought, Dr. M'Cosh proceeds *à posteriori*, from an inductive examination of conscious mental operations, and gives us the "fundamental laws of thought" as a supplementary conclusion.

Hamilton's great defect in his discussion of the elements of the judgment is that he has no place for abstracts. The notion is with him, as with all the Kantian logicians, simply a concept. *Redness* cannot be called a concept, with extension and intension, in the sense that the word is applied to *red*, much less as applied to a concrete, as *man*. Dr. M'Cosh accordingly divides notions thus:

NOTIONS—1. Percepts; the singular concrete, as Milton, Bucephalus.

2. Abstracts; as swiftness, beauty.

3. Concepts. (1) Generalized abstract; as red, swift.

(2) Generalized concrete; as poet, horse.

This analysis enables the author to use all that is really valuable in the Hamiltonian theory of the quantified predicate. Hamilton's universal affirmative with a universal predicate, (A, f, a), marks a valuable distinction in the case of substitutive judgments—for example, definitions and mathematical propositions. Following the above analysis of the notion, it will be seen that in all such judgments the terms are abstracts or percepts; for example, $2(a + b) = 2a + 2b$ is a judgment wherein both subject and predicate are abstracts. "Washington was the father of his country" predicates an abstract of a percept. Such

judgments may be regarded as mathematical equations, wherein neither term can be said to have extension or intension. All the notions that the mind can form fall into one of these three classes, yet they may also be mixed together; especially may the same word be both abstract and concept, as virtue is an abstract primarily, but afterward comes to denote a class, becoming a concept, as when we speak of the virtues, justice, temperance, etc.

Judgments may then be divided into two classes: 1. That wherein the agreement is that of identity or equality; and 2. Where there is a joint agreement of extension and intension. Hamilton's U is there accepted with this limitation, while his Y, y, and w are discarded.

The author admits Hamilton's principle, that whatever is contained implicitly in spontaneous thought should be unfolded explicitly in logical forms, but denies with Trendelenberg that this leads to the "thorough-going quantification of the predicate." Much of our thinking is in intension, (comprehension, depth,) and here the quantity of the predicate is, of course, unthought of. To use Trendelenberg's illustration and application, (*Logische Untersuchungen*, ii, 204,) when we say, "Man is responsible," we mean that man has the attribute responsibility, without thinking whether there are other responsible beings or not. To say, "All men are all the responsible," is to say that man has this attribute, and that no other being has it—that is, it is combining two judgments in one, a synthesis rather than an analysis. There is, then, no propriety in using the sign of mathematical equality to express the joint agreement of extension and intension.

Still further, Dr. McCosh shows that Hamilton is guilty of an ambiguity in the use of "all." "It is clear, that when we say simply, 'All men are rational,' we mean (when the judgment is explicated in extension) that every one man, every one in the class man, is in the class rational. But, if we have further found that every rational being is in the class man, we are entitled to say, 'All men are all rational.' But what do we mean when we say so? The terms, it appears to us, are no longer general, standing for each and every one of a class; we do not mean, 'Every one man = all rational,' nor 'Every one man = every rational.' The word 'all' does not now mean 'every one,' but the whole collectively. The meaning, in fact, now is, 'The whole class men = the whole class rational.' If so, the terms are not general, applicable to each and every one of an indefinite number, but singular, with a process of abstraction involved." Pp. 101, 112.

Upon these points we think that Dr. M'Cosh's criticism of Hamilton must be accepted as thorough and decisive.

Yet we cannot clearly make out what is our author's idea of the logical judgment. Here he seems to agree wholly with Mill, yet we are unwilling to believe that such is the fact. He says nothing whatever of the valuable Kantian distinction between judgments logical and psychological, but, having defined the notion as the object apprehended by the mind, he defines the judgment as the comparison of two objects of mental apprehension, being careful to say that he does not mean thereby two *mental states*, but *objects apprehended*. But certainly the external objects are not in the mind to be compared. When we assert, 'Alexander was ambitious,' we have not the *man* Alexander in our minds, for he died some years ago; we have a notion 'Alexander,' and a notion 'ambitious,' two mental states, which we compare and assert to agree. But we do more than this: we also assert the existence of objective realities corresponding to the percept 'Alexander' and the abstract 'ambitious.' Here, then, are two judgments, the first logical, and the second psychological, united in one proposition. The first simply asserts agreement between the mental states, the second asserts the existence of objective realities corresponding to the notions. In discursive thought we use nothing but notions or mental states; but in speech, when judgments are put into language, we refer to the objects of possible intuition which the notions represent. We do not understand why the author, by thus making no reference to a distinction that must be familiar to him, seems to coincide entirely with Mill in the analysis of the judgment.

The book is highly readable, not needlessly technical, the recondite discussions being dropped into finely-printed paragraphs so that they can be omitted if desirable. The author uses abundant illustrations, discarding diagrams, occasionally affording us glimpses through long vistas of practical thought, or leading us up to the edge of speculative deeps, which suggest that our guide has a comprehensive view of adjacent regions, to which he might conduct us if he would. N.

Annual of Scientific Discovery; or, Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art, for 1870. Exhibiting the most important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Biology, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc. Together with Notes on the Progress of Science during the year 1869; a list of recent Scientific Publications; Obituaries of eminent Scientific Men, etc. Edited by JOHN TROW-

BRIDGE, S. B., Assistant Professor of Physics in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; aided by SAMUEL KNEELAND, M.D., Professor of Zoology and Physiology in the Institute, and W. R. NICHOLS, Graduate of the Institute. 12mo., pp. 354. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1870.

Three great events are specified in the introductory notes by the Editor of the *Scientific Annual*, as distinguishing the year 1869, in the great department of international intercourse—the Suez Canal, the Pacific Railroad, and the French Cable. Railroad construction is improving, both in new forms of cars, and the introduction of steel as the material for rails. This last improvement is a great securer of safety, and from the durability of material, in the long run the cheapest. When the telegraph, now being rapidly laid from St. Petersburg to the mouth of the Amoor, is completed, but a narrow marine link is needed to complete the circuit of the globe. Steam and electricity will rapidly revolutionize Asia.

The celebrated chemist, Dumas, in his lecture on Faraday, makes some statements justifying our refusal to accept the assertions of many physicists, that chemistry can account for all the phenomena of life:

The existing chemistry is all powerful in the circle of mineral nature, even when its processes are carried on in the heart of the tissues of plants or of animals, and at their expense; but she has advanced no further than the chemistry of the ancients in the knowledge of life and in the exact study of living matter; like them, she is ignorant of the mode of generation.

The chemist has never manufactured any thing which, near or distant, was susceptible even of the appearance of life. Every thing he has made in his laboratories belongs to "brute" matter; as soon as he approaches life and organization he is disarmed.

These statements very conclusively check the sanguine words of a note to Professor Barker's lecture, elsewhere noticed: "The chemist is capable of producing from carbonic acid and water a whole host of organic bodies, and we see no reason to question his ultimate ability to reproduce all animal and vegetable principle whatsoever." Perhaps he may yet put up a sign on his laboratory door reading, "Horses and men made to order."

Dr. Carriere, of Jean du Gard, gives the following very simple method of ascertaining actual death:

Place the hand, with the fingers closely pressed one against the other, close to a lighted lamp or candle; if alive, the tissues will be observed to be of a transparent, rosy hue, and the capillary circulation in full play; if, on the contrary, the hand of a dead person be placed in the same relation to light, none of these phenomena are observed—we see a hand as of marble, without circulation, without life.

- Professor Owen substitutes, in place of Darwin's *Natural Selection*, a new doctrine of *Derivation* of one species from another by primordial law:

Professor Owen, like Lamark and Darwin, rejects the principle of direct or miraculous creation, and recognizes a "natural law, or secondary cause," as operative in the production of species "in orderly succession and progression." To Cuvier's objection, that, if the existing species are modifications, by slow degrees, of extinct ones, the intermediate forms ought to be found, he replies, that many missing links in the paleontological series have been found since 1830. He gives several examples of these modifications, and dwells specially on *hipparion*, and the other forms between the fossil *palæotherium* and the present genus *equus*.

The difference between Natural Selection and Derivated is thus stated :

Species owe as little to the accidental concurrence of environing circumstances, as *Cosmos* depends on a fortuitous concourse of atoms. A purposive route of development and change, of correlation and interdependence, manifesting intelligent will, is as determinable in the succession of races, as in the development and organization of the individual. Generations do not vary accidentally, in any and every direction, but in pre-ordained, definite, and correlated courses.

"Derivation" holds that every species changes, in time, by virtue of inherent tendencies thereto. "Natural Selection" holds that no such change can take place without the influence of altered circumstances educating or selecting such change.

"Derivation" sees among the effects of the innate tendency to change, irrespective of altered surrounding circumstances, a manifestation of creative power in the variety and beauty of the results; and, in the ultimate forth-coming of a being susceptible of appreciating such beauty, evidence of the preordaining of such relation of power to the appreciation. "Natural Selection" acknowledges that if ornament or beauty, in itself, should be a purpose in creation, it would be absolutely fatal to it as an hypothesis.

"Natural Selection" sees grandeur in the view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms, or into one. "Derivation" sees therein a narrow invocation of a special miracle, and an unworthy limitation of creative power, the grandeur of which is manifested daily, hourly, in calling into life many forms, by conversion of physical and chemical into vital modes of force, under as many diversified conditions of the requisite elements to be so combined.

"Natural Selection" leaves the subsequent origin and succession of species to the fortuitous concurrence of outward conditions. "Derivation" recognizes a purpose in the defined and preordained course, due to innate capacity or power of change, by which homogeneously created *protozoa* have risen to the higher forms of plants and animals.

Mental Philosophy: Embracing the three Departments of the Intellect, Sensibilities, and Will. By THOMAS C. UPHAM, D. D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Bowdoin College, Member of the Academy of Metaphysical and Ethical Sciences, Author of "Æsthetic and Moral Letters," "The Interior Life," "Divine Union," etc. In two volumes. Volume I, The Intellect, with an Appendix on Language. Volume II, The Sensibilities and Will. 12mo., pp. 561, 705. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1869.

This is a new edition, revised, but not largely altered, of a work published more than thirty years ago, well known to metaphysical scholars, and extensively used in our higher seminaries and colleges. Though written in the modest style, and perhaps a little too fluid and diffuse, it has hardly been surpassed by any manual of complete psychology. There was no little originality in the work, for which the able author seems hardly to have received due credit, from the fact that its advanced views infused

themselves so gently into the public mind that the public easily forgot whence they came. Professor Upham had to feel and pioneer his way to the acknowledgment of the Will as one of the three co-ordinate faculties of the mind, in opposition to Edwards and Brown, who admitted but two, and identified the will with the desires. This view gave a shock to the scheme of Edwards, even in the system of American necessitarian theology. Dr. Upham is a very cautious as well as lucid thinker. He is firm and fearless where his ground is firm beneath him. He makes no bold dashes into untenable positions. Both in the matter of the intuitions, and of the freedom of the will, he makes the most skillful advances up to the unknowable, and stops with a very gentle decision the moment he has reached its boundary. These volumes are still truly standard, and worthy the high place they have occupied in public estimation.

Wonders of Glass-Making in all Ages. By A. SAUZAY. Illustrated with sixty-three Engravings on Wood. 12mo., pp. 325. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

The Sun. By AMEDEE GUILLEMIN. From the French. By A. L. PHEPSON, Ph.D. With fifty-eight Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 297. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Wonders of the Human Body. From the French of A. LE PILEUR, M.D. Illustrated by forty-five Engravings by Lévuillé. 12mo., pp. 256. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

The Sublime in Nature. Compiled from the Descriptions of Travelers and Celebrated Writers. By FERDINAND DE LANOYE. With large Additions. 12mo., pp. 344. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Wonders of Architecture. Translated from the French of M. LEFEBRE. To which is added a chapter of English Architecture, by R. DONALD. 12mo., pp. 288. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

Wonders of Italian Art. By LOUIS VIARDOT. Illustrated with twenty-eight Engravings. 12mo., pp. 339. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

The above volumes furnish part of a brilliant series of small duodecimos, in red and gilt, on the most attractive topics of science and history. They are a remarkably successful series of efforts at making valuable knowledge fascinating in the acquirement.

History, Biography, and Topography.

The Invitation Heeded. Reasons for a Return to Catholic Unity. By JAMES KENT STONE, S.T.D., late President of Kenyon College, Ohio, and of Hobart College, N. Y. 12mo., pp. 341. New York: Catholic Publication Society. Boston: Patrick Donahoe. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1870.

Dr. Stone's conversion to Romanism came upon him, he tells us, sudden as "a shock." The great Council was about assembling, the Pope's broad invitation to all non-Catholics to come under

his wing was issued, and deep misgivings filled his soul. The long array of arguments for Rome and against Rome had for years been in his full view, and he had strenuously through life persisted in seeing force solely in the latter. A change came over his vision. Suddenly, as by a supernaturalism, the solid fortifications of Protestantism became thin vapor, and the vapory bulwarks of Rome hardened to iron. By a still more wondrous miracle the iron became flexible, shaped itself into a mighty armor, and, harnessing around his person, equipped him at once as a redoubtable hero and champion of the faith. So rapid and thorough was his conversion, that the preface to his work embraces the Latin and English call of the Pope to the heretics, and a fervent prayer containing an invocation to the blessed Virgin as "refuge of penitent sinners." The book impresses us with the sincerity and piety of the author, and, however deep the mental aberration of the change, we do not fear that he has stepped out of the pale of salvation.

The volume is divided into three parts. The first considers Romanism historically, as to its past permanence, its influences on public morals, civilization, and progress, in contrast with the "failure of Protestantism," and its responsibility for persecution. Part second treats the argument for Roman Churchdom from Scripture and antiquity. Part third treats of the Popedom, its scriptural and historic proofs, and its unity, authority, and infallibility. The style is animated, personal, and often eloquent; the logic rather fragmentary, and often requiring its cracks and yawns to be puttied in with unctuous declamation. It is an earnest, fluent, weak book.

The most effective part is where he asserts the benefits of the Church unity in the Middle Ages over the barbarous and semi-civilized tribes of Europe. Inheriting a great amount of undestroyed Pagan civilization, blended with a sublime, expansive spirituality that Paganism never knew, the Romish Church, even in asserting her own autoeracy, united, spiritualized, and educated Central and Northern Europe toward, if not into, the Christian civilization which we now inherit. That love of power, carried out by a stupendous amount of force and fraud, constituted a large share of her impulses, is no doubt true. Yet there were virtues also, sanctities, philanthropies, heroisms, and wisdoms, which we scorn to depreciate, and which we claim as belonging to our nature, to our ancestry, and to our common Christianity. The crimes of Rome are specially two: her stupendous false-

hoods and her stupendous cruelties—both exerted beyond all known measure, in authentic history, in support of her autocracy. When Christendom outgrew her pupilage, when her eyes became too intelligent to be cheated with the myths of the Papacy, the Papacy, of course, refused to recognize her own obsolescence, and sought to rule with falsehood and blood. In spite of all her purple pomp and her œcumenical display, each advancing year reveals her senility, and the attempt of good, weak men like Dr. Stone to restore her youth are as wise, and will prove as successful, as the aspirations of a modern Hindoo to revive the glories of old Buddhism.

The weakest part of Dr. Stone's book, as it necessarily must be, is the attempt to prove the sovereignty of Peter over the other Apostles, his Roman episcopate, and the Papal successorship to him. The *Scripture argument* to prove Peter's authority over his fellow-Apostles is pure childishness. A pre-eminence, founded, it may be, entirely upon his seniority of age and weight of character, there does appear; but of a dictatorship *over* his fellows, or of a subjection of them under his dictation, not one unequivocal syllable can be found in the New Testament. It is in exaggerating this pre-eminence into *command* that Papal advocates display a sophistry of which it is difficult to believe them not to be conscious. Peter's episcopate at Rome, also, has not one particle of proof that an historian can recognize. Surely Dr. Stone must know what irrelevant buncombe he utters when he prattles about its being a point unquestioned for centuries. Surely he must be the scholar to know that what historical criticism requires is *contemporaneous* testimony, or near enough to contemporaneous, to evince personal knowledge. Over that point Dr. Stone skips, as if committing a conscious dodge. And Peter's episcopate being a myth, the entire chain of Petrine successorship in the Papal line is hooked at the upper end to a nothing, and drops by its own weight. The figment may be bellowed by every bull that roars from Rome, but it is nothing but a stupendous and sonorous lie. It is time the tiresome nuisance were abated.

There are other very important points—as, for instance, the Papal persecutions—on which Dr. Stone seems to exercise the same conscious flimsiness. His fluid declamation sounds like heroics underlaid with misgivings, and his footsteps move with the fearful alacrity of a man nimbly running on thin ice.

We are gratified that the Catholic Publication Society appears

in the field of argument before the American public. We wish they would publish an edition of Janus, and we would readily recommend every reflective Protestant carefully to read Stone and Janus in the same week.

History of the American Civil War. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M.D., LL.D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York, Author of a "A Treatise on Human Physiology," "A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe," etc. In three volumes. Volume III, Containing the Events from the Proclamation of the Emancipation of the Slaves to the End of the War. 8vo., pp. 701. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

How far Dr. Draper has succeeded as an accurate narrator of the facts of our history we do not feel prepared to judge. In the mastery of a graceful English style, we have heretofore intimated we do not think him eminent. His work will, we doubt not, furnish very many valuable hints to the future historian, without ever becoming a standard history.

Educational.

An English-Greek Lexicon. By C. D. YONGE. With many New Articles, an Appendix of Proper Names, and Pilon's Greek Synonyms. [To which is prefixed an Essay on the Order of Words in Attic Greek Prose, by CHARLES SHORT, LL.D., Professor of Latin in Columbia College, New York.] Edited by HENRY DRISLER, LL.D., Professor of Greek in Columbia College, Editor of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon," etc. 8vo., pp. 778. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Professor Drisler has laid upon our table a very solid block of Greek erudition. There is something monumental in its look—monumental as embodying the work of many a noble scholar, and as a reminder that we have, at the present day, and in our own country, an elect few competent to complete their labors upon the noblest language ever spoken by man.

The immediate basis of the work is the Lexicon of Yonge, which had brought to a consummation the task of giving the authorities for the various uses of each word. To this Professor Drisler has given many corrections, as well as original additions of his own. We have thus the most complete English-Greek Lexicon ever published.

A very important feature of the book is the learned and elaborate treatise on the order of Greek words by Professor Short, of Columbia College. Such an aid to the art of Greek composition, though of the utmost importance, has not hitherto existed. Professor Short's treatise, covering a hundred closely printed octavo pages, though embodying a large amount of contributions by his

predecessors, is largely original, and, when completed to his own satisfaction, will not only be a grateful aid to the student, but will be viewed as a fine achievement of our American Greek scholarship.

Literature and Fiction.

Evenings with the Sacred Poets. A Series of Quiet Talks about the Singers and their Songs. By the Author of "Festival of Song," "Salad for the Solitary," "Mosaics," etc. 12mo., pp. 495. New York: Anson D. Randolph & Co. 1870.

It is but a few years since it began to be admitted that a hymnist was a poet; just as it was a startling proposition that Bunyan was a great genius. It is very gratifying, therefore, to note how many critics and amateurs have, at the present day, taken a pleasure in leading us over the sacred anthology of the Church. The present volume may rank among the most entertaining of the number. The author ranges over the entire field, showing slight regard for boundary lines, whether chronological, geographical, or denominational.

His plan embraces, after the biblical and Greek, the Latin, early and mediæval; the German of the Reformation-era and the Thirty Years' War; Swedish, French, Spanish, etc.; English, early and later; and finally, English and American, of the present day. The work displays a full mastery of the field, a fine critical power, a catholic and evangelical Christian spirit. Mr. Randolph has done up the externals in very graceful style, presenting a volume very acceptable to the lovers of hymnal literature.

Pamphlets.

The Correlation of Physical and Vital Forces. (University Series, No. 2.) By Professor GEORGE F. BARKER, M.D., Yale College. 12mo., pp. 36. New Haven, Conn.: Charles C. Chatfield. 1870.

This is the second of a series of scientific tracts, to be issued from a New Haven press, embracing the productions of scientific master-minds in Europe and America, in uniform size, suitable for binding volumes.

Professor Barker essays to explain the doctrine of the "Correlation of Forces," and to show that mind is but one of the phenomena of matter. The doctrine which, awkwardly as it seems to us, is named the "Correlation of Forces," is simply this: Motion, heat, light, electricity, and magnetism are all but different

forms of the same substratum, and are reciprocally and quantitatively convertible into each other. The last four are not, as has heretofore been supposed, independent agents, "imponderable substances," but merely properties of matter, or different forms of the one property, *motion*. When either one of these five is made to disappear, it forthwith re-appears in some other one of the five, and in just the proportion of amount. Hence there is forever the same amount of this motion or force in existence. And this is that famous "doctrine," the discovery and demonstration of which are pronounced, for what reason we do not clearly see, the greatest scientific achievement of the present century, rivaling the first discovery of gravitation.

But Professor Barker here assumes to prove, what Youmans and others have maintained before him, that, besides these five, a sixth is to be included, namely, *life—life*, including all the phenomena of *thought*, which have heretofore been attributed to an independent agent, or "imponderable substance," called *mind*, *soul*, or *spirit*. He endeavors to show, from various experiments, that heat is convertible into thought, and thought into heat; so that thought is but the motion of the brain. This brings us back to the old Democratic doctrine that there is nothing in the universe but matter and motion.

In his closing paragraph the Professor asks, "Is there no immortal portion separable from this brain tissue?" and he replies, "Here science veils her face, and bows before the Almighty," and makes his appeal to "revelation" and "faith." He avoids showing how his demonstrations do not exclude "faith." Nor does he take pains to show us how the negation of all finite spirit does not destroy "the Almighty." Perhaps the universe is a great cerebrum in eternal motion, thinking with infinite wisdom, and acting with infinite power; and so—God!

The first number of the "series" is Huxley's "Protoplasm;" the third, Sterling's reply to Huxley.

On this general topic we jot the following suggestions:

1. One of the most fundamental of all the maxims of both philosophy and theology is Plato's: Mind is prior to matter. Mind is superior and all comprehending; matter is good for nothing, and might just as well be so much vacant space but for its subserviency to mind. One monad of mind, if solely existing, would be worth a whole universe of matter alone. Hence, when the Materialist makes mind an appendage to matter, an accident, or property, he commits a *hysteron-proteron*, a cart before the horse, a *præ-posterous* proposition.

2. Mind, as before all things, is the producer of all things. It is first cause, the source of causation. All power, all force, resides primarily in mind; and all exertion of power, all eventuality, and all motion, come from mind. Mind is the source of motion.

3. When the theologian, ages ago, declared that *God is omnipotent*, he asserted, previous to any philosophy, the indestructibility of *force*. He declared that the amount of force existing is always the same, namely, *infinite*. And there is no objection to saying that the amount of force measured out by the Almighty to our mundane creation is always the same, unless varied by miracle. The infinite mind, with infinite power, controls the universe.

4. When the Materialist affirms that thought is a *property of matter*, we will assent if he will change a term and say, *thought is a property or motion of substance*. For God is a personal *substance*; and so is *spirit* or *mind*. And so we agree that thought is the motion or action of conscious mind or spirit.

5. Has any physiologist, any embryologist, any morphologist, explained the minute molecular causations why the fetus in the human womb does not assume the shape of a lizard or tadpole? Do any of the laws of chemistry or natural philosophy constitute, singly or collectively, a *plastic power* by which we can see how the specific human form is molded? We know that soul (of the parent) is a previous condition; and on the principle that the fetus, patterned to a plan, is truly "mind-molded," we may assume that *the soul* of the fetus really and truly shapes the body. Mind is prior to matter, and body is soul-shaped and soul-pervaded.

6. If mind or spirit is prior to matter and source of causation, mind is capable of impact and impulse upon matter. This we see demonstrated in the action of the will-power upon body and upon external objects. And mind is consciously susceptible to impact from matter, as is demonstrated from the phenomenon of sensation. Isaac Taylor calls corporeity "an amalgam of mind and matter;" and by that amalgam man is the contact point, the mediation, between the world of matter and the world of spirit. By this means thought appreciates a blow upon the body. So that conscious soul stands in correlation with both antecedent and subsequent material conditions.

7. But the great point with our physicists is, that thought is now demonstrated to be one of the six convertibles of force or motion. *Thought is a mode of motion*. How, then, can there be an immortal soul? We reply: Thought is the motion of con-

scious spirit; of spirit capable of receiving impulse from, and communicating impulse to, matter in correlation with it. But the soul is, perhaps, immortal only in the conditions of immortality; and eternally capable of spiritual motion or thought only in the conditions of thought. We have no proof that, separate from body, spirit may not be eternally placed by God in the conditions of life and thought-motion. We have abundant proof that it is so placed.

Miscellaneous.

THE SOUTHERN GENERAL CONFERENCE.

"That notorious Commission," as it was courteously styled by the "St. Louis Advocate," presented itself before the Southern General Conference in the persons of Bishop Janes and Dr. Harris. They were received with unsurpassable hyperboles of cordiality and courtesy in both word and action. They were waited upon by a most honorable committee selected by the Conference, were invited to unfold their message audibly before that venerable body, were listened to with the profoundest respect and attention, were honored personally with a complimentary resolution, were greeted in private with the heartiest and most winning Southern frankness, and invited to fill pulpits belonging to the Church South. There is nothing more fascinating than the blandishments of our chivalrous Southern brethren. We have known some of the noblest specimens of human nature belonging to that kin. And when underlaid with a stamina of genuine moral character, no spiritual magnetism is more attracting. Yet, alas! in this case, as often, underneath the rosy wreath was the double-edged sword. Cut and dried for the crisis of the presence and speech of our two victims, Dr. Keener, the most bitter of the Southern editors, (leaving the rabid and ribald "Tom-Bond" out of the count,) drew from his pocket a series of resolutions denying that the delegates had any official business there, declaring that separate organizations must be firmly maintained, and re-affirming the response of the Southern Bishops at St. Louis. The entire triad of resolutions, after review by a Committee, were, with silent, prompt, automatic precision, all passed in lump by a unanimous rising vote.

The most significant point of the three is the indorsement of the Episcopal manifesto. And the most significant point in that Episcopal manifesto was the declaration, that the absolute condition to

the South's hearing any proposals of fraternization is our recognition of the so-called "Plan of Separation." And the significant point in said "Plan" is, that both Churches must retreat to the boundary line that divided the free and slave States; that is, the Methodist Episcopal Church must abandon her three hundred thousand members in the Southern States, with all her churches and other institutions, confess the sin of her intrusion, limit herself north of Mason and Dixon's line, and then the Church South will graciously listen to and consider her petition for an exchange of ecclesiastical courtesies. It was thus that the Southern Bishops, with the profoundest professions of Christian love and burning desire for Christian union, did, with the most graceful and decisive explicitness, lay down conditions for fraternization which they very well knew included self-stultification, self-extermination, and self-degradation on the part of our General Conference. Confess yourselves fools and knaves, and then we will hear your proposals; and then we will trample on your proposals, because, by your own profession, you are fools and knaves. And let no one for a moment imagine that both the Bishops and the General Conference South do not understand and deliberately intend the full force of this "Plan." In 1848 Dr. Pierce said, in his parting words to our General Conference, the condition of our receiving any offer from you is the "Plan of Separation." The Bishops at St. Louis quote his language, and in 1869 say, "His words are our words." Their unanimous General Conference in 1870, by the most plainly *concerted* action, unanimously adopt the "words" of these same Bishops. So that through twenty-two eventful years this pseudo "Plan of Separation" has been the sole condition for reconciliation. The conclusion, therefore, is as irresistible as fate, that the representative bodies of the Church South mean to make ecclesiastical recognition an impossibility, by prescribing terms which no man's self-respect would permit him to consider. But perhaps another quadrennium may work a revolution.

Meantime a new South is coming into existence, upon which we must concentrate our attention and our forces. Already our Southern Methodist Episcopal Church numbers nearly half as many as the Church South. Immigration from Europe and the North will constitute a new population, with no warlike recollections, no regret for dead slavery, no sympathy for an obsolete Church, demanding the ministrations from a Methodism of a free and loyal history. Ready to co-operate with every Christian body, yet accepting no restraining limitations, let us enter with

renewed energy the inviting field, and another generation will see a free, unsectional, untrammelled Methodism covering our entire country.

Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. With Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev. HENRY COWLES, D.D. 12mo., pp. 363. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1870.

One of a series of volumes on the Old Testament, which have heretofore received favorable notice in our pages, by the learned Oberlin professor. We may safely recommend it to scholars and Christian readers.

The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. Translated from the original Hebrew, with a Commentary, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical. By E. HENDERSON, D.D., Author of Commentaries on the Books of the Minor Prophets, Jeremiah and Lamentations, Isaiah, etc. 8vo., pp. 228. Andover: Warren F. Draper. New York: Felt & Dillingham. 1870.

Dr. Henderson's Commentaries have sustained a high rank in England, and will no doubt be welcomely-received by the American clergy.

Homiletics and Pastoral Theology. By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, D.D., Baldwin Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. Eighth edition. 8vo., pp. 439. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

A History of Christian Doctrine. By WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, Professor of Biblical Literature in Union Theological Seminary, New York. In two volumes 8vo., pp. 408, 508. Vol. I. Third edition. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

New editions of valuable works which have been favorably reviewed in our *Quarterly*.

The Elements of the Hebrew Language. By Rev. A. D. JONES, A.M. 8vo., pp. 163. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1870.

Mr. Jones has been successful in furnishing for the beginner in Hebrew a horn-book marked by singular clearness and simplicity.

The Word; or, Universal Redemption and Salvation: "Pre-ordained before all Worlds." A more Evangelical, Philanthropic, and Christian Interpretation of the Almighty God's Sacred Promises of Infinite Mercy, Forgiveness, and Grace. Reverently submitted to Christendom. By GEORGE MARIN DE LA VOYZ, a Septuagenarian Optimist. 8vo., pp. 320. London: Whittaker & Co., Trübner & Co.

Memoir of the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., Thirty-six Years Missionary in India. By Rev. J. B. WATERBURY, D.D. 12mo., pp. 307. New York: Harper & Bros. 1870.

American Political Economy; including Strictures on the Management of the Currency and the Finances since 1861, with a Chart showing the Fluctuations in the Price of Gold. By FRANCIS BOWEN, Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity in Harvard College. 12mo., pp. 495. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

The History of Rome. By THEODORE MOMMSEN. Translated, with the Author's Sanction and Additions, by the Rev. WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D., Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Glasgow, late Classical Examiner in the University of St. Andrew's. With a Preface by Dr. LEONHARD SCHMITZ. New edition, in four volumes. Vol. II. 12mo., pp. 568. Vol. III. 12mo., pp. 571. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870.

A Manual of Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; including the Decisions of the College of Bishops, and Rules of Order applicable to Ecclesiastical Courts and Conferences. By HOLLAND N. M'TYEIRE, D.D., one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. 24mo., pp. 256. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1870.

Self-Help. With Illustrations of Character, Conduct, and Perseverance. By SAMUEL SMILES, Author of "The Life of George Stephenson, and his Son, Robert Stephenson," "The Huguenots," etc. 12mo., pp. 447. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

In Spain and A Visit to Portugal. By HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN, Author of the "Improvisatore," etc. Author's Edition. 12mo., pp. 289. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Cambridge: Riverside Press. 1870.

Our Father in Heaven. The Lord's Prayer Explained and Illustrated. A Book for the Young. By Rev. J. H. WILSON, M.A., Barclay Church, Edinburgh, Scotland. 12mo., pp. 325. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1870.

The Juno Stories. Mary Osborne. By JACOB ABBOTT, Author of the "Rollo Books." Small 12mo., pp. 301. Red and gilt. New York: Dodd & Mead.

Juno Stories. Juno and Georgie. By JACOB ABBOTT. Green & gilt. Small 12mo., pp. 312. New York: Dodd & Mead.

Life and Alone. Green and gilt. Small 12mo., pp. 407. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

Elm Island Stories. The Young Ship-Builders. By Rev. ELIJAH KELLOGG. Green and gilt. Small 12mo., pp. 304. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1870.

Popular Library of History for Young People. "Stories of Old England," "The Hero of Brittany," "History of the Crusades," "Count Ulrich of Lindburg." 16mo. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1870.

Out in the World; or, A Selfish Life. By HELEN JOSEPHINE WOLFE. 12mo., pp. 288. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1870.

The Bazar Book of Decorum. The Care of the Person, Manners, Etiquette, and Ceremonials. 12mo., pp. 278. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

The First Book of Botany. Designed to Cultivate the Observing Powers of Children. By ELIZA A. YOUNG. 12mo., pp. 183. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Cæsar's Commentaries on the Gallic War. With Explanatory Notes, a Copious Index, and a Map of Gaul. By ALBERT HARKNESS, LL.D., Professor in Brown University. 12mo., pp. 377. New York: D. Appleton & Co. London: 16 Little Britain. 1870.

The Life of Bismarck. Private and Political; with Descriptive Notices of his Ancestry. By JOHN GEORGE LOUIS HESEKIEL, Author of "Faust and Don Juan," etc. Translated and Edited, with an Introduction, Explanatory Notes, and Appendices, by KENNETH R. H. MACKENZIE, T.S.A., F.A.S.L. With upward of One Hundred Illustrations by Diez, Grimm, Peisch, and others. 8vo., pp. 491. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Pater Mundi; or, Modern Science testifying to the Heavenly Father. Being, in substance, Lectures delivered to Senior Classes in Amherst College. By Rev. E. F. BURR, D.D., Author of "Ecce Cælum." In two volumes. Vol. I. 12mo., pp. 294. Boston: Nichols & Noyes. 1870.

Classical Study. Its Value illustrated by Extracts from the Writings of Eminent Scholars. Edited, with an Introduction, by SAMUEL H. TAYLOR, LL.D., Principal of Phillips Academy. 12mo., pp. 381. Andover: Warren F. Draper. New York: Felt & Dillingham. 1870.

God is Love; or, Glimpses of the Infinite Father's Affection for his People. From the Ninth London Edition. 12mo., pp. 366. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1870.

Fiction.

Lothair. By the Right Hon. B. DISRAELI. 12mo., pp. 371. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1870.

A Brave Lady. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," "A Life for a Life," "Olive," "The Ogilvies," "A Noble Life," etc. With Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 176. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Baffled; or, Michael Brand's Wrong. By JULIA GODDARD, Author of "Joyce Dormer's Story," "The Search for the Grail," etc. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 159. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Miss Van Kortland. A Novel. By the Author of "My Daughter Elinor." 12mo., pp. 180. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Debenham's Vow. By AMELIA B. EDWARDS, Author of "Barbara's History," "Half a Million of Money," "Miss Carew," etc. Illustrated. 12mo., pp. 178. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Home Influence. A Tale for Mothers and Daughters. By GRACE AGUILAR. New Edition. 12mo., pp. 386. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1870.

Beneath the Wheels. A Romance. By the Author of "Olive Varcoe," "Patience Caerlydon," "Simple as a Dove," etc. 12mo., pp. 173. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Tom Brown's School Days. By an Old Boy. New Edition, with Illustrations by Arthur Hughes and Sidney Prior Hall. 12mo., pp. 135. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1870.

Marion and Jessie; or, Children's Influence. By the Author of "Agnes Morton," "Honor Bright," etc. 12mo., pp. 210. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. 1870.

Notices postponed to next number :

Wakefield's Theology. Pittsburgh: J. L. Read & Son.

Mountford on Miracles. Boston: Fields & Osgood.

March's Anglo-Saxon Grammar. New York: Harper & Brothers.

DR. NAST.—We are informed by a note from Rev. Dr. Nast that he is not to be held as maintaining the doctrine of the Trinity, to which we objected in our late notice of the Bibliotheca Sacra. We expect to insert in a future number an article from his pen on the subject.